

7-1-53 100-21

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION (EDUCATION—PART 3)

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

APRIL 21 AND 22, 1953

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities

INCLUDING INDEX



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1953

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois, *Chairman*

BERNARD W. KEARNEY, New York

DONALD L. JACKSON, California

KIT CLARDY, Michigan

GORDON H. SCHERER, Ohio

FRANCIS E. WALTER, Pennsylvania

MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri

CLYDE DOYLE, California

JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Tennessee

ROBERT L. KUNZIG, *Counsel*

FRANK S. TAVENNER, JR., *Counsel*

LOUIS J. RUSSELL, *Chief Investigator*

THOMAS W. BEALE, SR., *Chief Clerk*

RAPHAEL I. NIXON, *Director of Research*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
April 21, 1953:	
Testimony of—	
Leo M. Hurvich.....	977
Theodore S. Polumbaum.....	988
April 22, 1953:	
Testimony of—	
William T. Martin.....	1014
Paul Rudolph Ziesel.....	1036
Isadore Amdur.....	1046
Max Weitzman.....	1061
Index.....	1071

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

17. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

121 (q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 83D CONGRESS

House Resolution 5, January 3, 1953

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress, the following standing committees:

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

17. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American Activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time, investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION (Education—Part 3)

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.
PUBLIC HEARING

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to call, at 10:37 a. m., in the caucus room, room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Kit Clardy, Gordon H. Scherer (appearance noted in transcript), Francis E. Walter (appearance noted in transcript), Clyde Doyle (appearance noted in transcript), and James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance noted in transcript).

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and Thomas W. Beale, Sr., chief clerk.

Mr. VELDE. The meeting will come to order.

Let the record show I have appointed a subcommittee consisting of Mr. Clardy and myself as chairman for the purposes of this hearing. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Is Mr. Leo M. Hurvich in the hearing room?

Mr. FORER. Mr. Chairman, may the record show we object to the absence of a full quorum of the committee.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute—after I swear the witness.

Mr. FORER. I wanted to get it in before—that is all.

Mr. VELDE. Will you raise your right hand?

In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. HURVICH. Yes; I do.

Mr. FORER. May the record show our objections, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. TAVENNER. Be seated, please.

TESTIMONY OF LEO M. HURVICH, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, JOSEPH FORER

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your name, please, sir?

Mr. HURVICH. Leo M. Hurvich.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. CLARDY. May I have that last name spelled? I didn't catch it.

Mr. HURVICH. It is H-u-r-v-i-c-h.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. FORER. Joseph Forer, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Hurvich?

Mr. HURVICH. I was born on September 11, 1910, in Malden, Mass.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. HURVICH. I am sorry. Where I am what?

Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

Mr. HURVICH. Rochester, N. Y.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your occupation?

Mr. HURVICH. I am an experimental psychologist.

Mr. TAVENNER. Employed by whom?

Mr. HURVICH. Eastman Kodak Co.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't catch the description of your occupation.

Mr. HURVICH. I'm sorry, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, in this room, I should warn you, the acoustics are bad, as we have discovered, and you will have to speak distinctly and fairly close to the microphone in order to be heard.

Mr. HURVICH. I am an experimental psychologist, working in the psychophysics color division.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal educational training has consisted of?

Mr. HURVICH. I went to the public schools, Chelsea, Mass. I received a bachelor of arts degree at Harvard College in 1932, master's degree, same institution, in 1934, and a doctor of philosophy at Harvard in 1936.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you followed any other profession before the beginning of the profession in which you are now engaged?

Well, let me put it this way: What has been your record of employment since the completion of your formal educational training in 1936?

Mr. HURVICH. I was an assistant in psychology for 1 year, 1936 to 1937.

Mr. TAVENNER. You mean an assistant professor?

Mr. HURVICH. No; assistant—research—not a research assistant—assistant in the department of psychology—a laboratory assistant, I guess.

Mr. TAVENNER. At what institution?

Mr. HURVICH. Harvard—1936 to 1937—and I was then an instructor in—from 1936—or 1937 to 1940.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where?

Mr. HURVICH. Harvard.

Mr. TAVENNER. In what field?

Mr. HURVICH. Psychology.

In 1940 to 1947—the middle of 1947—I was a research assistant in the laboratory, industrial physiology. The title varied some. I think it might have been called laboratory of industrial physiology and psychology of the graduate school of business administration, Harvard University.

(Representative Francis E. Walter entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. VELDE. At this point may the record show that I have appointed a new subcommittee for the purposes of this hearing, consisting of Mr. Clardy, Mr. Walter, and myself as chairman.

Mr. HURVICH. While on this job for 6 months or so—I'm not sure about the exact length of time—I worked for a research project associated with the Frankford—the Ordnance Division of the Frankford Arsenal—but that was on leave of absence when I did that work.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you describe more fully what this research job was with the Ordnance Division of which you spoke?

Mr. HURVICH. I was loaned for 6 months on a testing program to test some instruments that were being tested under conditions of cold weather?

Mr. TAVENNER. Were those secret weapons of the Armed Forces of the United States?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I think it would not be called a secret weapon at all, sir.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you have access during that period to information that was considered of a classified or secret or confidential character?

Mr. HURVICH. For only confidential character—to the best of my recollection, I never had any access to secret information.

Mr. TAVENNER. This work was done for the United States Government or in behalf of the United States Government, was it?

Mr. HURVICH. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you paid by the United States Government—

Mr. HURVICH. During that—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). For your services during that period of time?

Mr. HURVICH. During that interval; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. Who employed you to that position, and how were you employed?

Mr. HURVICH. By "who," you mean—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; what were the mechanics for employing you in that particular undertaking?

Mr. HURVICH. I think I was given a civil-service appointment for that 6 months, or at the end of it.

Is that what you mean?

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, that is in part an answer to my question, but not fully.

Mr. HURVICH. I'm not—

Mr. TAVENNER. Give us the mechanics under which your service in that work was solicited, and if it was solicited—

Mr. HURVICH. Oh, I believe it was.

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). Or whether you applied for the position.

Mr. HURVICH. No; I did not apply for the position. It was solicited. To the best of my knowledge there was a series of projects throughout various laboratories investigating roughly similar problems, and at the time the people in the Frankford project were in need of someone and asked the people at the project I was working on, Harvard, if I could be loaned to them; and I believe there was much discussion about my availability, and I think they said they could have me for 6 months, or approximately 6 months. I don't remember the exact—

MR. TAVENNER. Would you describe a little more fully to the committee what the nature of your work was?

MR. HURVICH. At that time?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes; during that 6 months' period.

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer).

MR. TAVENNER. Let me state I am not asking you to divulge information which was considered of a secret character and which should not be known publicly, if there is any information of that kind involved.

MR. HURVICH. I don't think I had information of that sort available to me. It was a project simply to determine the way the temperature varied on certain optical instruments.

MR. TAVENNER. Sir?

MR. HURVICH. The way the temperatures within certain optical instruments varied.

MR. TAVENNER. What was the period during which you were so employed?

MR. HURVICH. November—approximately November 1943 through about May or June 1944.

MR. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee, please, what the nature of your duties were while a resident instructor, as I understood, at Harvard, between 1940 and 1947, when you held the position of industrial physicist?

If I—

MR. HURVICH. Well—

MR. TAVENNER. What was the exact—

MR. HURVICH. I did no instructing.

I would like to get this clear: I have done no teaching whatsoever since the year 1940.

MR. TAVENNER. Then, will you define more clearly your occupation between 1940 and 1947?

MR. HURVICH. Between 1940 and 1947 I did experimental research in the area of vision and optical instruments mainly. They were concerned with problems of the performance of the eye, the way the eye functions under certain conditions of depth perception, under certain conditions of strenuous activity. I was concerned with the problems of investigation—investigating—on a satisfactory kind of illuminating conditions somewhere—problems of visual fatigue. I was doing experimental work in the laboratory throughout that 7-year period, with the exception of my leave of absence—and there I was working on instruments.

MR. TAVENNER. By whom where you employed in the performance of that work?

MR. HURVICH. Harvard University would be the ultimate employer.

MR. TAVENNER. What do you mean by "ultimate employer"?

MR. HURVICH. I was working in a laboratory with other persons, and I had an immediate supervisor. That's all I mean. He wasn't paying me personally, but—

MR. TAVENNER. But you—

MR. HURVICH (continuing). I was sort of on my own.

MR. TAVENNER (continuing). Were on the staff?

MR. HURVICH. I was on the staff.

MR. TAVENNER. Of Harvard University?

MR. HURVICH. That's right.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Hurvich, information has come to the committee, and the committee is in possession of it, which indicates that there existed in Boston during at least part of the time that you were at Harvard University an organized group of the Communist Party made up almost exclusively of members of the teaching profession, and information has come to the committee that you are in a position to help this committee by giving us facts within your knowledge regarding that organized group of the Communist Party, what its objectives were and what its methods of operations were. So, I want——

Mr. WALTER. Counsel, you might identify from what source we have received this information.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. WALTER. I think that is very important.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

Now, I would like to ask you whether or not there was a group, an organized group, of the Communist Party in Boston known to you personally to have been composed largely of members of the teaching profession?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. HURVICH. I refuse to answer on the grounds that this violates my rights of free speech and association under the first amendment and also on the basis of my privilege under the fifth amendment not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. TAVENNER. We have heard from other witnesses who have testified before the committee that one of the objectives of the Communist Party was to have its members infiltrate certain other organizations in that area, and the Teachers' Union in particular. Do you have any knowledge of your own of any efforts on the part of the Communist Party to infiltrate other organizations?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I refuse to answer that question for the reasons I have already stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Teachers' Union to which I have referred?

I believe the name is the American Federation of Teachers.

Mr. HURVICH. Yes; I was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Over what period of time were you a member?

Mr. HURVICH. I think I was a member of the Teachers' Union from 1948 [sic.], probably, until 1945 or 1946—I'm not exactly certain of the dates on that——

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period——

Mr. HURVICH (continuing). Or 1947; but I have been in the Teachers' Union. I am not positive of the exact dates involved.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time, did you become acquainted with a person by the name of Robert Gorham Davis?

Mr. HURVICH. Yes; I've met him.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Teachers' Union at the same time you were?

Mr. HURVICH. I believe he was.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Mr. Granville Hicks?

Mr. HURVICH. No; I don't know Mr. Granville Hicks.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you become acquainted with Dr. Wendell H. Furry?

MR. HURVICH. I know Dr. Wendell H. Furry.

MR. TAVENNER. Was he a member of the Teachers' Union at the same time you were?

MR. HURVICH. I believe he was.

MR. TAVENNER. Do you know of any Communist Party connection or affiliation of either of those gentlemen—Mr. Davis or Mr. Furry?

MR. HURVICH. I decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Davis testified before this committee as to how the effort was made to control the Teachers' Union by caucuses of Communist Party members prior to the meetings of the Teachers' Union. Do you have any knowledge of the holding of any caucuses by groups within the Teachers' Union who were members of the Communist Party?

MR. HURVICH. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons.

MR. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the Cambridge Branch of the American Association of Scientific Workers?

MR. HURVICH. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

MR. TAVENNER. Well, now——

MR. WALTER. What was the name of that organization?

MR. TAVENNER. The name of the organization was the Cambridge Branch of the American Association of Scientific Workers.

MR. WALTER. Is that a Communist organization?

MR. TAVENNER. It has never been so cited.

I don't believe it has ever been so cited. I should check on that.

MR. CLARDY. Is that the organization the witness Davis discussed?

MR. TAVENNER. Yes. Mr. Davis said that he, himself, was not a member, but he testified as to other persons who joined that organization.

It has not been cited by the Attorney General or by this committee, but it has been by a California committee.

Of course, in all of those front organizations there were many persons who were innocently in the organizations and who were not members of the Communist Party.

MR. WALTER. Well, Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to ask the witness several questions.

MR. VELDE. Mr. Walter.

MR. WALTER. Mr. Kurvich——

MR. HURVICH. It's Hurvich, sir. I think you mispronounced it. It's Hurvich.

MR. CLARDY. Would you spell it again?

I put down what you said, but with this microphone I am not sure.

MR. HURVICH. That is H-u-r-v—as in Victor—i-c-h.

MR. WALTER. Well, I called it Kurvich instead of Hurvich.

MR. HURVICH. That's right.

MR. WALTER. I apologize.

You knew what I meant.

MR. HURVICH. Yes.

MR. WALTER. Well, in view of the fact you knew it was not a crime, did you not, to be a member of the Communist Party, what criminal prosecution do you think could be instituted against you if you decline to answer the question whether or not you were a member of an

organization that has not been cited by the Attorney General as being a Communist organization?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I decline to answer that question on the same reasons previously given.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Mr. Israel Halperin—H-a-l-p-e-r-i-n?

Mr. HURVICH. I think not, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. You say you think not. Do you have any recollection at all?

Mr. HURVICH. I may have seen him. I don't—I don't think I know him. I think I may have seen him in Cambridge, but that is the reason I say I think not. I don't know.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, can you identify—

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). The person more fully, or maybe help him refresh his memory?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes. Maybe I can refresh his recollection.

He was a member of the Cambridge branch of the American Association of Scientific Workers.

Does that assist you in recalling his name?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. No.

Mr. TAVENNER. Subsequent to his leaving Harvard University he went to Canada, and there he was prosecuted, though acquitted, in the Canadian trial under the Canadian War Secrets Act.

Does that refresh your recollection?

Mr. HURVICH. I believe—

Do you have the date on his leaving Harvard?

I think he was out of Harvard before I was there.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, if you don't know him, how would you know he was out of Harvard before you were there?

Mr. HURVICH. The reason—the name does sound familiar. I'm only trying to indicate I don't think I knew the man.

Mr. CLARDY. But if you didn't know him—

Mr. HURVICH. I am trying to say—

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). You knew of him?

Mr. HURVICH. The name is familiar, and now that you mention him there is a possibility he was back in Cambridge and attended a luncheon of the Teachers' Union. That may be the only connection which that man's name has any meaning at all.

Mr. CLARDY. Then what you are saying is you do have some recollection of the man as a person—

Mr. HURVICH. Yes; but I don't know him.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Without knowing him personally?

Mr. HURVICH. That is right.

Mr. CLARDY. In other words, he was not a friend of yours?

Mr. HURVICH. Or an acquaintance, neither.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Davis testified that he was a member of the Communist Party group of which he was a member while a teacher at Harvard University and that he had joined the Cambridge branch of the Association of Scientific Workers as one of the duties of a Communist Party member of that group.

Does that in any way refresh your recollection?

Mr. HURVICH. That who joined?

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Halperin.

Mr. HURVICH. I don't know Mr. Halperin, to the best of my knowledge. I think the Congressman—Congressman Clardy—phrased that as well as I could possibly do. I think I heard the name and may have known who he was around Cambridge—

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you—

Mr. HURVICH (continuing). But I don't know him, or don't even know him as an acquaintance.

(Representative Clyde Doyle entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, you seemed uncertain about it, and possibly by recalling facts that are within the knowledge of the committee regarding the individual it may help you to recall the facts, and I want to present another set of facts to you.

The committee is in possession of information that during the course of Mr. Halperin's trial a committee was established by the Cambridge branch of the Association of Scientific Workers for the purpose of studying that trial and that eventually funds were solicited at Harvard for the purpose of defending Halperin in his trial.

Does that refresh your recollection regarding him?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. What is that supposed to refresh my recollection of, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. TAVENNER. As to your having known a person by the name of Halperin.

Mr. HURVICH. I didn't know Mr. Halperin.

Mr. TAVENNER. You say you didn't know him, but when I asked you that question you were uncertain as to whether you knew him.

Mr. HURVICH. Only because—

Mr. TAVENNER. Just a minute.

Mr. HURVICH. Sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do these facts which I have related cause you to believe you never knew him, when you were uncertain to begin with?

If you were uncertain to begin with as to whether or not you knew him, how can you be so certain now after recitation of these facts—

Mr. HURVICH. Upon the first—

Mr. TAVENNER (continuing). That you did not know him?

Mr. HURVICH. Upon the first mention of the name, I simply paused, stopped, to think of the man. I was uncertain, as I think most people might be under such circumstances; and, as you proceed, I am more certain I don't know him personally, or never met him. I'm sorry.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, I think he has explained it.

Mr. CLARDY. May I add—

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me.

Mr. VELDE. I think he has explained, to his knowledge, his acquaintanceship with Mr. Halperin, but I would like to ask this question: Were you a part of the organization that was created to defend Mr. Halperin?

Mr. HURVICH. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. CLARDY. May I just ask one question?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you ever attend a Communist Party meeting with Mr. Halperin?

Mr. HURVICH. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you ever have any knowledge of Mr. Halperin being a Communist?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. CLARDY. That is all, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you make any contribution to Mr. Halperin's defense?

Mr. HURVICH. I refuse for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now——

Mr. WALTER. What crime is a person guilty of who contributes to any cause at all, no matter what it is?

What crime did I commit when I contributed \$200 to the Anti-Fascist League at a time it was fighting Hitler? What crime was committed?

Mr. HURVICH. I don't know, sir.

Mr. WALTER. Well, now, you have declined to answer questions on the grounds that you might become incriminated; and then when I asked you what crime, you say you don't know.

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I didn't know what crime you were guilty of when you contributed, is what I am saying.

Mr. WALTER. Well, now, what crime do you think you were guilty of when you contributed to the defense of Mr. Halperin, if you did?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I refuse to answer that question on the same grounds earlier stated.

Mr. WALTER. Well, then, you feel to answer my question as to what crime you think you would be guilty of if you answered the question as to your contribution might incriminate you?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I decline for the same reasons.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you think, Witness, a flat statement that you never belonged to any organization communistically inclined would incriminate you in some way?

Mr. HURVICH. Would you rephrase that or restate it?

Mr. CLARDY. Read it to him, Mr. Reporter.

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

Do you think, Witness, a flat statement that you never belonged to any organization communistically inclined would incriminate you in some way?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you think a refusal to answer——

Mr. HURVICH (continuing). For the same reasons.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). That question will in some way endanger you or put you in jeopardy?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). And before you answer I want to point out this to you, sir: That you are entitled to raise the defense of

the fifth amendment, but only in good faith; and what these questions are aiming at is to discover whether or not there is a solid basis for your raising it or whether it is a frivolous objection, merely designed to circumvent the purposes for which this committee was created.

Now, then, you may answer.

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. In reply to your first—your last statement, I would like to emphasize—and emphasize strongly—that I don't think I'm taking this frivolously. I'm trying to answer the questions in good faith. I believe, however, that the cross-examination which you are now proceeding in is an effort to, in effect, get behind my claim of privilege and, therefore, I assert my privilege again because it is simply another method of asking the same question.

Mr. CLARDY. Am I to construe that, sir, as a refusal to answer my last question on the grounds previously advanced?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I don't remember the last question. I'm sorry, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you read it to him, Mr. Reporter?

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

Do you think a refusal to answer that question will in some way endanger you or put you in jeopardy?

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. My refusal to answer it won't put me in jeopardy.

Mr. CLARDY. You think not?

Mr. HURVICH. I believe so.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, you may be in error, of course, in that.

Mr. HURVICH. Well——

Mr. CLARDY. That is all.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HURVICH. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons previously mentioned.

Mr. TAVENNER. Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. HURVICH. I decline to answer that question for the same reasons.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Is your apprehension, Witness, based on the fact you might be incriminated in some way, other than being discovered to be a Communist?

Mr. HURVICH. In some way other than being discovered to be a Communist?

Mr. CLARDY. Right.

Mr. HURVICH. My apprehension is pretty general in the sense that——

(At this point Mr. Hurvich conferred with Mr. Forer.)

Mr. HURVICH. I shall refuse to answer that question, sir, for the same reason.

Mr. CLARDY. That is all.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Walter.

(No response.)

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier.

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Hurvich, you were called here because you have some information—or we are fairly certain you have some information—that would help the committee in performing its functions. I want to ask you this question, in all due respect to counsel: If you hadn't had counsel present, would you have answered the questions that were put to you by our counsel?

Mr. HURVICH. Would I have answered them in the same way?

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. HURVICH. I believe I would have answered them in the same way; yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Or declined to answer them in the same way.

Mr. HURVICH. Declined to answer them in the same way.

Mr. FORER. I guess that shows I'm not much good around here.

Mr. VELDE. Is there any reason why this witness shouldn't be continued under subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Witness is excused, and the committee will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

(Whereupon, at 11:10 a. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 11:20 a. m.)

(The hearing reconvened at 11:32 a. m.)

Mr. VELDE. Will the reporter let the record show at this point present are Mr. Clardy, Mr. Scherer, Mr. Walter, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Frazier, and the chairman, a quorum of the full committee.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Polumbaum, would you stand and be sworn?

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this committee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you represented by counsel, Mr. Polumbaum and, if so, would counsel state his name and address for the record?

Mr. SHUBOW. Lawrence D. Shubow—S-h-u-b-o-w—10 Tremont Street, Boston.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Shubow, have you personally ever appeared before this committee—I mean as a lawyer, counsel?

Mr. SHUBOW. No; I've been before the—what's the other committee?

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, you haven't been before this committee?

Mr. SHUBOW. As far as I know.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then, you understand you may confer with your client but you, yourself, may not speak unless you are sworn as a witness.

Mr. SHUBOW. I may serve merely as counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. You may confer privately with your client at any time.

Mr. SHUBOW. As counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. As counsel.

Mr. SHUBOW. I understand.

**TESTIMONY OF THEODORE S. POLUMBAUM, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS
COUNSEL, LAWRENCE D. SHUBOW**

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state your full name and present address, Mr. Polumbaum?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. My name is Theodore S. Polumbaum, 123 Norwood Avenue, Newtonville, Mass.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I was born June 4, 1924, in a Brooklyn Jewish hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you briefly outline your educational background for the committee?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes. I was graduated from Harrison High School, Harrison, N. Y., in June of 1942. I entered Yale University the summer of 1942.

My education was interrupted in 1943, when I entered the Army in February of 1943. I served 3 years in the Armed Forces, spent 18 months in the Pacific theater, and was discharged from the Army in January of 1946, resumed my studies at Yale in the fall of the same year and was graduated from Yale University June 1948.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, would you outline your employment background, including temporary positions held by you during student days at college?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You want a complete employment background?

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's say—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I have difficulty recalling all the temporary—

Mr. KUNZIG. To the best of your recollection.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I am presently employed as a television script writer, Boston Bureau of the United Press. I have been with the United Press since July 1950. Prior to that time I was employed by a public relations and research organization known as Radio Reports, Inc., in New York City, and from June 1948, until December 1949, I was employed as a reporter-photographer, deskman, with a daily newspaper in Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNZIG. What city of Pennsylvania?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. York.

Mr. KUNZIG. York, Pa.

And what was the name of the paper?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. The Gazette and Daily.

Mr. KUNZIG. Gazette and Daily.

Prior to the time you were in York, Pa., what was your employment?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I had various odd jobs in college. In addition to being a scholarship student from the college itself in Yale, I worked in the law library as an assistant for a brief period—I don't know exactly when—and I worked in a factory, in the packing department of the rubber factory—I can't even remember the name—while at school.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Polumbaum, your employment then—the first employment after you got out of college—was with the York newspaper, and then you went to this Radio Reports, Inc., and then finally, from July 1950, until the present time, with United Press?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, during your student days at Yale University, were you acquainted with an organization known as the John Reed Club?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I would like to state to the committee that I will not answer that question or any similar questions referring to my political affiliations and beliefs, and I will not cooperate with this committee in any attempt to get me though—in any attempt to ask me to waive my rights under the first and fifth amendments. Further, I should like to state that I will not answer any such questions on grounds that I—I will not be compelled to bear witness against myself or against any others and to turn informer before this committee and to cooperate in the apparent efforts of this committee to disparage and belittle the Bill of Rights, on which I am standing, and ultimately, I believe, to destroy these rights.

Mr. CLARDY. Pardon me, Counsel.

Witness, did you understand that question was no more than asking you if you knew of the organization, not whether you were a member, not whether you were a Communist—nothing of that kind—merely did you know of that outfit?

Now, with that understanding, will you answer the question?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes; I knew of that organization.

Mr. CLARDY. You had that in mind when you gave the answer?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That I knew about the organization? No; I misunderstood—

Mr. CLARDY. That you knew the purpose of the question. It was not to inquire as to membership, but as to whether or not you knew there was such an organization.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I misunderstood the question. Pardon me.

Mr. CLARDY. You understood, then.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask that he be directed to answer the question.

Mr. KUNZIG. He has answered.

Mr. CLARDY. Obviously his objection—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I have answered the question sir.

Mr. CLARDY. No; he didn't answer it. He raised the objection and refused to answer on the grounds of the fifth and the other amendments.

Mr. KUNZIG. He answered it.

Mr. VELDE. Well, now, do I understand you decline to answer the question?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Will you rephrase the question, please?

Mr. KUNZIG. I will repeat the question.

Mr. Polumbaum, during your student days at Yale University, were you acquainted with an organization known as the John Reed Club?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I knew of such an organization; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. What type of club was the John Reed Club? What was its purpose?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. So far as I know, this was an organization which brought speakers to lecture before groups on Marxism.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of the John Reed Club?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question. I don't believe the committee has a right to ask that question. I will refuse to answer it on the grounds which I have just stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I request respectfully that the witness be required and asked that he answer this question.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. That is a question that is very simple. I can see no way in which it can incriminate you under the fifth amendment of the Constitution. You are directed to answer the question.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I repeat—I will refuse to answer that question because to answer it would be cooperating with this committee's purpose to disparage the Bill of Rights, and I will not waive my rights under the first and the fifth amendments in answering this question. I refuse to answer the question because I will—I cannot be compelled to bear witness against myself or others under the fifth amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Wait a minute. You said "myself or others."

Mr. SHUBOW. And others.

Mr. WALTER. "* * * against myself or others."

Mr. SHUBOW. And others.

Mr. WALTER. Well, all right—"and others."

Now, what part of the Constitution are you talking about?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. The fifth—

Mr. WALTER. Where in the Constitution is there anything that even infers that a person can't be compelled to give testimony against somebody else in any kind of proceedings, criminal or civil?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Sir, the fifth amendment to the Constitution states that no witness may be compelled to bear witness against himself or to testify—

Mr. WALTER. Wait a minute.

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). Against himself, and I—

Mr. WALTER. Wait a minute—in any criminal proceedings.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. WALTER (continuing). Most of the witnesses who invoke the fifth amendment very conveniently fail to state the entire amendment.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. WALTER. This is not a criminal proceeding.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Are you denying my right to invoke the fifth amendment in these proceedings?

Mr. WALTER. Indeed not.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, that is what I am doing.

Mr. CLARDY. We are denying you the right to raise it in a frivolous manner, sir, because you are endangering your own liberty when you do that.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I think the attempt to disparage the fifth amendment is being done here and this committee, as it has done in past hearings, is belittling this amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. If we ask you any questions at all, we are disparaging the fifth amendment, in your judgment?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. No; I didn't say—

Mr. CLARDY. Is that the statement you are making?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. No, sir.

I will answer all questions which I believe proper.

MR. WALTER. You will choose the questions that you will answer; is that what you are saying?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

MR. POLUMBAUM. I will answer all questions which don't call upon me to waive my rights, sir.

MR. KUNZIG. Have you attended any—

MR. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Counsel.

MR. KUNZIG. Pardon me, sir.

MR. VELDE. I would like to pursue the question of Mr. Walter for a moment.

I believe you said that you were a law student or worked in the law library at Yale.

MR. POLUMBAUM. I worked in the law library for a brief period.

MR. VELDE. Well, Mr. Walter asked you whether the Constitution protected you, the fifth amendment of the Constitution protected you, against incriminating or testifying about somebody else other than yourself.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

MR. VELDE (continuing). Now, do you have the feeling that you are protected by the fifth amendment—

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

MR. VELDE (continuing). In testifying against somebody else other than yourself?

MR. POLUMBAUM. Well, the fifth amendment protects me against testifying against myself, and I believe if I waive this amendment that, therefore, that I then waive all my right not to testify against others; is that correct?

That once I waive my rights under the Consitution, specifically the fifth amendment, this committee can then make me an informer—

MR. WALTER. Just a minute.

MR. POLUMBAUM (continuing). On my friends and associates.

MR. WALTER. At that point, Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

MR. VELDE. Yes.

MR. WALTER. What do you mean by an informer?

MR. POLUMBAUM. An informer is one who informs and gives information about his associates which may be used to damage their reputation or bring them before this committee or subject them to prosecution or persecution—

MR. CLARDY. Do you mean—

MR. POLUMBAUM (continuing). A stool pigeon.

MR. CLARDY (continuing). You would object, then, to telling this committee about anything of which you had knowledge concerning someone else if that someone else was engaged in some conspiracy against the United States?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

MR. CLARDY (continuing). Is that what you mean, sir?

MR. POLUMBAUM. If I were asked to give my testimony concerning the illegal activities or an illegal conspiracy in which other people are involved, I would disassociate myself from such people by condemning them and denouncing them—

MR. CLARDY. And you would answer—

MR. POLUMBAUM (continuing). In evidence before this committee.

MR. CLARDY. And you would answer questions about those people?

MR. POLUMBAUM. Who are engaged in illegal activities.

MR. CLARDY. Then if we should ask you about someone's membership or possible membership in the Communist Party, would you decline to answer such a question?

MR. POLUMBAUM. I would decline—excuse me.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

MR. POLUMBAUM (continuing). I would like to restate my position. I will not answer any questions of this committee concerning what I believe in or what my political affiliations are or the political affiliations of anyone with whom I am associated.

MR. CLARDY. Well, that doesn't answer my question, but we will drop that.

I want to ask you one further question: Have you ever attended meetings or hearings before this committee before today?

MR. POLUMBAUM. No, sir.

MR. CLARDY. How, then, can you positively talk about the actions of this committee with respect to the fifth amendment if you have had no experience with us, sir?

MR. POLUMBAUM. Well, I have consulted with my lawyer.

MR. CLARDY. Oh, you have had advice of your attorney that we are violating the fifth amendment—

MR. POLUMBAUM. I haven't—

MR. CLARDY (continuing). When we ask these questions?

MR. POLUMBAUM. I haven't finished.

MR. VELDE. Now, I don't think we should go into what his attorney—

MR. CLARDY. Well, I would differ with you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. VELDE. I am sorry.

Continue.

MR. CLARDY. I think it is important that we discover whether he is doing this—

MR. SHUBOW. I think—

MR. CLARDY (continuing). Of his own account.

MR. VELDE. Continue, Mr. Counsel.

MR. KUNZIG. Have you been at any time a member of the Communist Party?

MR. POLUMBAUM. I won't answer that question on the grounds I have previously stated, and I would like to state further that this committee—this committee is asking me questions and implying certain accusations in such a way as to assume the functions of a grand jury without affording the protections of a grand jury. In the grand jury procedure, a person who has been accused or who places an accusation against such a person—

MR. VELDE. Mr. Witness, you are not—

MR. POLUMBAUM. May I continue, please?

MR. VELDE (continuing). Answering the question.

MR. POLUMBAUM. May I—

MR. VELDE. You are making a purely voluntary statement, and it is purely argumentative.

MR. POLUMBAUM. I think this comes under due process.

MR. VELDE. The committee will not listen to anything further along that line. We have heard enough of that before.

I will ask you to answer the questions or refuse to answer them.

MR. POLUMBAUM. I would like to state I am stating a further ground for refusing to answer this question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. When you go beyond the fifth amendment, you have transgressed. Now, the chairman has told you how far you can go.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, the process—the due process is a part of the fifth amendment, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Are you relying on the fifth amendment in refusing to answer that last question?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I think the committee in attempting to restrict me to stating fifth amendment—fifth amendment—is in itself belittling the fifth amendment, and I should like to make clear the fifth amendment occupies an honorable part of the Constitution and I don't want to be put in a position of belittling it, because this is my right and, under due process, I am entitled, if, under—an accused person is entitled, under grand jury procedure, to seek—

Mr. VELDE. Well, now, just a minute. You are not accused of anything. You were brought here this morning to give some information to this committee relative to subversive activities in the United States. That is our duty—that is our function—to investigate and find out facts relative to subversive activities in this country.

I just wonder if you are familiar with the report of the Subversive Activities Control Board which was issued yesterday.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I read—

Mr. CLARDY. You are nodding your head. You mean yes?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes; I read the report in the newspapers.

Mr. VELDE. And isn't it true that the Subversive Activities Control Board found that the Communist Party of the United States was a subversive organization?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes; that's what I read, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Do you believe that the Communist Party of the United States is a subversive organization—

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Designed to overthrow our form of government?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, again, sir: you are infringing on the area of my own opinions and belief, and I would refuse to answer that question—

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). On the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). I didn't hear you then. Were you declining to answer?

It is difficult to hear you.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes, on the grounds this committee was infringing on my own political beliefs, and on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. VELDE. You still believe that the American Communist Party is a political organization?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I said I refuse to answer any—I refuse to answer this question, and your second question, and any questions, political questions, of that nature on the grounds previously stated.

Mr. CLARDY. Any question dealing with the Communist threat to this Nation you will decline to answer, then; is that what we are to understand?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. No; I will decline to answer any question which probes into my political beliefs.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, asking you whether you agree with the Subversive Activities Control Board's finding in your opinion is probing into your beliefs, then?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes; you're asking my opinion—a political opinion.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you understand you are thereby implying to this committee that you may be a Communist or you approve of the Communist doctrine when you refuse to take a stand?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. No, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Don't you see that?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. No, sir. I believe the implications—that the implications this committee is trying to make——

Mr. WALTER. May I interrupt right at this point?

This is not an implication. We believe—as a matter of fact, we know—that you at some time or another were a Communist.

Now, you have an opportunity to tell us things we want to know——

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. WALTER (continuing). About the activities of Communists with whom you were associated.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I have been informed I haven't been accused of anything. Now you are accusing me of something.

Mr. WALTER. Well, all right, if the shoe fits——

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. WALTER (continuing). You say I am accusing you. All right, let's say that.

Mr. CLARDY. You, sir, are——

Mr. WALTER. I say you have been a Communist.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You are making an accusation?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. If you have any information——

Mr. WALTER. Are you——

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). Or evidence that I have engaged in any illegal conspiracy or any illegal activities, or committed any illegal act—and you cannot have such evidence because I have never committed any illegal activities—you should take this evidence to the proper authorities and you should have me prosecuted and give me a day in court under due process.

Mr. WALTER. Well, that may follow——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You have not——

Mr. WALTER (continuing). But what we are interested in now is ascertaining to what extent you and your associates made any progress at all in this international conspiracy to overthrow our form of government. That is what we are interested in for the moment, and we hope that you will cooperate with us.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. This committee is attempting to imply that by invoking my constitutional rights—and specifically under the fifth amendment—that that itself is an admission of a crime; but the fifth amendment and the other rights guaranteed in the Constitution are designed to protect people like myself from just such political—political investigations.

Mr. WALTER. Do you think what I stated to you was an implication?

Am I implying you are a Communist when I say to you I know you have been one?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You are making an accusation.

Mr. WALTER. I am not implying. You just said I was implying something. I am not implying anything.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. WALTER (continuing). I am stating to you that I know you have been a member of the Communist Party.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. WALTER (continuing). That is no implication.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness, I believe that you said you were employed by the United Press at the present time as a script writer; is that right?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That's correct.

Mr. VELDE. I would like to read into the record a memorandum from the United Press Associations as follows:

Our records show that Theodore S. Polumbaum is 28 years old. He became an employee of the United Press in 1952 with United Press' acquisition of Acme News Pictures and since that time has served as a picture caption writer and darkroom technician in the Boston bureau. Acme's records show that he was hired by Acme in July 1950, and assigned to its Boston picture bureau. His application form says that he was graduated from Yale in 1948. Before joining Acme he worked for a year and a half as a reporter and deskman on the York (Pa.) Gazette.

UNITED PRESS ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. CLARDY. Is that a correct recitation?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. The description of my job is not quite correct.

Mr. CLARDY. Is it too flattering or does it understate?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. No; it doesn't mention I have been writing television scripts.

Mr. VELDE. Well, would you clarify it, then, Mr. Witness?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, I have been a television script writer both for Acme News Pictures and for United Press. That has been my main job. I have performed other duties, as a darkroom assistant, as caption writer for United Press, but the fact, script writing, is not mentioned—and it is a fact, sir——

Mr. WALTER. How long have you been a script writer?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Since 1950, when I became associated with Acme News Pictures.

Mr. CLARDY. What kind of scripts?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. News scripts for television news.

Mr. CLARDY. Oh, it isn't in the form of a play or playlet?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. No; nonfiction.

Mr. CLARDY. You are not a humorous writer; you are just writing straight news?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That's right.

Mr. CLARDY. May I ask him one more question?

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. CLARDY. Is it your assumption, at the bottom of your relying on the fifth amendment, then, an admission of membership in the Communist Party would amount to admitting that you were guilty of some crime of some sort?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Are you asking me why I am using the fifth amendment?

Mr. CLARDY. I am not asking you why anything. I am asking you just as I worded my question.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Would you repeat the question, please?

Mr. CLARDY. Will you read the question to him, Mr. Reporter?
(The reporter read the question as follows:)

Is it your assumption, at the bottom of your relying on the fifth amendment, then, an admission of membership in the Communist Party would amount to admitting that you were guilty of some crime of some sort?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I am not required to make any assumptions.

Mr. CLARDY. I can't hear you.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I believe I am not required to make any assumptions in my use of the fifth amendment. I simply state I will not answer questions of the type the committee has put forward to me under the fifth amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. You know——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I am standing——

Mr. CLARDY. You know that the Communist Part has not as yet been outlawed and is, therefore a legal party——

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. CLARDY. In the United States.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I believe it's outlawed in Massachusetts.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well. Then, how is it possible for an admission of membership in the Communist Party liable to make you subject to prosecution of some sort? You have any explanation?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I don't believe I have to explain my grounds for invoking——

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't ask you——

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). Constitutional rights.

Mr. CLARDY (continuing). Whether you had to. I asked you whether you had such.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. CLARDY. Did you answer?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, to ask me to explain why I will not be a witness against myself is—is to destroy my right not to be a witness against myself.

Mr. CLARDY. I didn't ask you that at all.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever attend Marxist lectures at Communist Party headquarters in New Haven, Conn.?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That is a question which is similar to the others I have been asked. An accusation is implied there, and I repeat that I will stand on my previous grounds and not answer these questions.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Witness, may it be understood that any accusation that is made against you is not in the form of an indictment. This is not a court of law. It is not in the form of an indictment which might tend to incriminate you.

Is that understood by you?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes; I realize that—that the committee has no grounds for bringing criminal action against me——

Mr. VELDE. That is fine.

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). But what the committee is doing is trying me by publicity and endangering my employment.

Mr. VELDE. I assure you the committee has no interest at all in your employment. We are out to determine, to ascertain facts relative to subversive activities in this country; and I believe—of course, I cannot speak for United Press—if you would furnish us the information that we are asking that probably your job would be a lot more safe than it is at the present time—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, you are asking me—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). In the testimony.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You are asking me, then, to waive my rights.

Mr. WALTER. Well, now, just let me interrupt you at that point. You talk about the activities of this committee endangering your position. Well, the fact of the matter is you now have a great opportunity to disprove allegations heretofore made about you.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Are you—

Mr. WALTER. I mean before you came before this committee and testified, as you have now testified, this committee had testimony, sworn testimony, of witnesses that appeared before it of your activities in the Communist Party. So, you see, this committee has nothing to do with placing your position in jeopardy, if that is the fact.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. By the very act of making public these charges against me in the atmosphere of today, in the atmosphere of hysteria and fear, in light of the political beliefs or independent political views which I hold, this committee has tended to damage my reputation and endanger my employment.

Mr. WALTER. Now, you talk about independent political views. Is that the reason why these Communists in New York were sent to the penitentiary, because they had independent political views?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I can't speak for the—

Mr. WALTER. All right.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I can't give you the reasons why the Communists were sent—

Mr. SCHERER. Well, isn't it a fact that the Communist conspiracy is jeopardizing the jobs and the life of all of us in this country?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You speak of the conspiracy. Do you imply that I—do you charge me, accuse me, of engaging in illegal activities—

Mr. SCHERER. No; I didn't say—

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). Or illegal conspiracy?

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Anything about that.

You, Mr. Witness, said asking you questions about your Communist affiliations was jeopardizing your employment.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. What this committee is doing, I believe, is acting under a presumption of guilt, which is contrary to our traditions.

Mr. SCHERER. It is no longer a presumption of guilt—

Mr. CLARDY. Witness—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). As far as membership in the party is concerned.

Mr. CLARDY. Witness, when the testimony is—

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute, Mr. Clardy.

MR. CLARDY. Oh, I thought Mr. Scherer was through.

I beg your pardon.

MR. SCHERER. I just said it is no longer a presumption of guilt as far as membership in the party is concerned.

MR. POLUMBAUM. Well, Mr. Walter—

MR. SCHERER. As Mr. Walter said, the testimony is conclusive that you were a member of the party.

MR. POLUMBAUM. Well, Mr. Walter—

MR. SCHERER. In testimony before this committee—

MR. POLUMBAUM. Mr. Walter has said—

MR. SCHERER (continuing). That is no longer a presumption as far as we are concerned.

MR. POLUMBAUM (continuing). "You have the opportunity to clear yourself before this committee." That is the same as saying, I believe, that this committee considers you guilty.

MR. WALTER. Yes; we do. At least I do.

MR. POLUMBAUM. In other words—

MR. WALTER. There has been no denial of the sworn testimony adduced heretofore and, therefore, I am left with no other conclusion, you see.

MR. POLUMBAUM. Is this committee denying me the right to cross-examine my accusers?

MR. WALTER. Well, we are proceeding under the rules of the House and under the rules of the House there is no provision made for witnesses to interrogate—

MR. POLUMBAUM. Is this a denial—

MR. WALTER (continuing). Other witnesses.

MR. POLUMBAUM. Isn't this a denial of due process and a denial of trial, when an accusation is made under the sixth amendment?

MR. CLARDY. Witness, is giving you an opportunity, in open hearing, to deny any possible connection with the Communist conspiracy infringing upon your rights and doing you damage?

Should we, if we have information about anybody that has been made public, deny that person an opportunity, as we are giving you, to appear here and state the facts as he knows about them?

MR. POLUMBAUM. I don't believe this committee has the right to investigate political opinions and associations.

MR. CLARDY. In other words, we have no right or duty to investigate the Communist conspiracy; is that your position?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

MR. POLUMBAUM. I believe that this committee—if this committee has any evidence of illegal activities or illegal conspiracy, it is certainly within its right to bring this evidence before the proper authorities and have any persons so charged brought into court.

MR. CLARDY. That is what we are doing. We are bringing it to the attention of the American people—the real jury that will convict those of you that may be engaged in that conspiracy.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

MR. POLUMBAUM. In other words, you are admitting this is trial by publicity?

MR. CLARDY. No, sir; this, sir, is giving the people an opportunity to see how this apparatus works.

MR. POLUMBAUM. I believe—

MR. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Polumbaum, while at Yale were you acquainted with a medical student by the name of Joseph Cort—C-o-r-t?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Is this question relevant to the business of the committee?

Mr. KUNZIG. This question is most relevant, Mr. Chairman, and I ask the witness be directed to answer.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you repeat it?

Mr. VELDE. I am sorry.

Will you repeat the question?

Mr. KUNZIG. The question is: While at Yale were you acquainted with a medical student by the name of Joseph Cort—C-o-r-t?

Mr. VELDE. And what was the witness' answer?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I asked: Is this relevant to the—to the business of the committee, and how is it relevant—in what way?

Mr. KUNZIG. And I requested then that the witness be directed to answer the question.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. The committee's counsel is asking you some very simple questions——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, I'm not——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). To try to find out facts relative to subversive activities. This question, in my opinion, is a proper question. It is a simple question, and in line with the duties imposed by the House of Representatives on this committee; and so I direct you to answer that question.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, I will not answer the question on the grounds I have previously stated. I will not discuss my—I will not put the finger on myself or other persons before this committee.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Joseph Cort to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That is a similar question, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just——

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will stand on the rights—on the grounds—I have previously stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. We will understand this, as I think the chairman has already indicated—that when you say “I refuse to answer” from now on you are standing on the grounds you have previously stated.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. But that doesn't preclude me from making statements and answering the question in my own way, does it?

Mr. KUNZIG. If you wish to answer the question, then——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Will the refusal to state my grounds——

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Witness, let me advise you of this: If you will answer the question “yes” or “no,” or give a real answer to the question, then the committee would allow you to explain your answer; but a refusal to answer will not permit you to make a legal harangue——

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Or to heap more insults on this committee.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Polumbaum, you said a moment ago in your testimony that you would testify freely with regard to any wrongdoing that you knew of and that you would testify before this committee on any official acts of wrongdoing.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Any illegal——

Mr. KUNZIG. Any illegal acts.

You apparently, then, don't consider activity within the Communist Party of any of your associates or of yourself to be a wrongdoing?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I would simply state that I am not aware of any, and any questions brought up by this committee of any illegal acts committed by anyone—

Mr. KUNZIG. In your opinion, any activity within the Communist Party, or membership in the Communist Party, is not a wrongdoing or is not against the best interests of this country?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I believe that in asking that question the committee is asking me to give a political opinion.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you refuse to answer it?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I refuse to answer.

Mr. KUNZIG. I understand.

Now, did you know a William Kerner—K-e-r-n-e-r—to be a member of the Communist Party in your group at Yale?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I repeat—I will not bear witness against myself or anyone else.

Mr. KUNZIG. You refuse to answer?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know Arthur Levy—L-e-v-y—to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I believe the committee is just attempting to harass me. You know what the answers to these questions are going to be.

Is this necessary—to go through a whole list—or is it for the purpose of the record that the committee is attempting to point out that Ted Polunbaum is standing on the fifth amendment and this is—this is not his right?

Are you attempting to belittle this right by repetitiously putting forth these questions?

Mr. VELDE. May I again remind you, Mr. Witness, that you were called to the committee by subpoena—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Of a committee of Congress, duly constituted committee—and that we have some questions to ask you relative to subversive activities, and we are not going to listen to questions from you. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. You refuse to answer the last question?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. While a student at Yale, did you know Daniel Fine—Dr. Fine—who testified before this committee a few days ago?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will refuse to answer that question and all similar questions, and the committee will save itself time if it does not ask them.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Ben Dontzin—D-o-n-t-z-i-n?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not be an informer against anyone.

Mr. VELDE. Is that your answer that you stand on?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I refuse to answer that question.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know—

Mr. VELDE. It is understood it is on the—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. On previous grounds.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Grounds of the fifth amendment and all the protection afforded you in the Constitution?

(No response.)

Mr. SCHERER. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute.

You nodded your head. Will you answer, please?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand it is the right of counsel to confer and advise his client, but it is not the right of counsel to say to him to testify "I'll not be an informer against anyone." That isn't the duty of counsel before this committee.

Now, I saw counsel tell him to give that answer.

Mr. SHUBOW. Now, Mr. Congressman, counsel will have to do his duty as he sees fit. You are a Congressman. You do your duty as you see fit, and I will make a conscientious effort to do my duty as I see fit by way of protecting the rights of my client.

Mr. SCHERER. Yes, but you don't——

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Counsel, you have a right to confer with your witness, to advise him, as to his constitutional rights.

Mr. SHUBOW. Yes; I understand, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. But that is all.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you hold membership in the John Reed Club at the same time as William Rubinstein—R-u-b-i-n-s-t-e-i-n?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question on the grounds I have previously stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. While a student at Yale, did you know Harold T. Woerner—W-o-e-r-n-e-r?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you hold membership in the Communist Party with Jerry Brown—B-r-o-w-n?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Polumbaum, while you were a student at Yale, did you ever participate in door-to-door or neighborhood campaigns for the sale of the Daily and Sunday Worker?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question on the grounds that it involves political activity, and I will not answer any questions involving political activity on the grounds I have previously stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Isn't it a fact, Mr. Polumbaum, that while at Yale you worked for the Communist Party distributing literature, Communist Party literature, in the industrial plants and the factories in the New Haven area?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. These are all similar questions, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. KUNZIG. I request that——

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). And you know what my answer is.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). The witness be required to answer the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. That is a very simple question. You can answer it "Yes" or "No," or refuse to answer it, and you are so directed.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Why is the committee asking me all these similar questions, to which it knows how I will answer?

It knows the answer, and I have stated my grounds.

Now, I have refused to answer these other questions, and I refuse to answer this one.

Mr. VELDE. I again tell you, Mr. Witness, you were called here to answer questions and not to ask them.

Now, you may answer or refuse to answer, and further than that we are not going to listen to a lot of harangue.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will refuse to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Polumbaum, this committee's investigation in the New Haven area produced evidence which strongly points to domination and control of the Young Progressives and the Progressive Citizens of America in New Haven by individuals who were members of the Communist Party. Were you active among the Young Progressives when you were at New Haven?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question because it deals with my political affiliations, and I have already stated my grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you at any time elected to or appointed to the Connecticut State Youth Council of the Communist Party?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend the convention of the Connecticut State Communist Party held at 222 LaFayette Street, New Haven, Conn., on July 16, 17, and 18?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. While at Yale, were you acquainted with Paul R. Ziesel—Z-i-l-s-e-l—who is a graduate student in physics?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will not answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you affiliated with any Communist Party group while you worked in York, Pa.?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. The committee knows I will not answer that question on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Mr. Polumbaum, I have here a document marked "Polumbaum Exhibit No. 1" for identification, entitled "Application for Employment by Theodore S. Polumbaum, United Press Association." It is signed on the back "Theodore S. Polumbaum."

I hand you this document and ask you whether the signature at the bottom is your signature.

The question is whether the signature is your signature.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That's my signature.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, I will read for the record, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, the statement which was signed here.

This document was subpoenaed from the United Press, from its official files.

Mr. Polumbaum is, of course, as has already been testified, presently employed by the United Press.

May I have the permission of the committee to read pertinent portions of this document into the record?

Mr. VELDE. Yes; proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. On page 4, the back page of the document, under the heading of "Organizations" the following appears:

Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party, any Communist-front organization, the German-American Bund, or any other organization which has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States as being subversive?

Then the word "No" appears typed in there.

And then it says:

If so, explain.

Clubs, fraternities, associations, and societies.

And typed in the document is American Newspaper Guild; B'nai B'rith.

Then there appears:

Certification—the statements contained herein are true, and if found subsequently to be incorrect I agree to resign immediately upon request without making any protest or claim.

Then it is signed "Theodore S. Polumbaum."

Now, is it correct, Mr. Polumbaum, that you signed this prior to your present employment with the United Press?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That was some time during that employment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Some time during the employment. At the beginning, I presume, of the employment—toward the beginning?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. When Acme Newspictures was taken over by United Press.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, will you—

Mr. VELDE. I am sorry. I didn't get that last answer.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. When—I signed that some time after Acme Newspictures was absorbed by the United Press.

Mr. KUNZIG. But you signed it upon the request of United Press?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, will you reaffirm under oath—

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that this statement was not under oath.

Will you reaffirm here before this committee, under oath, the contents of this statement—namely, that you have never been a member of any Communist Party or a Communist-front organization or any organization designated by the Attorney General of the United States as being subversive?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You are asking me to answer in a different form the same question about Communist Party affiliation which I refused to answer, and I will refuse to answer that question on the grounds—

Mr. KUNZIG. The same grounds?

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). The grounds I previously stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now in order to avoid confusion, I will put it to you exactly in the same form which you have already signed, I presume in good faith, when you became employed by the United Press: Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party, any Communist-front organization, the German-American Bund, or any other organization which has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States as being subversive?

That is the question in the exact form as put to you by the United Press.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will refuse to answer that question before the committee, as I have refused to answer previous questions of affiliation, on the grounds I have stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you refusing to answer the question in 1953 because you are now under oath, where you were perfectly willing to answer it when you originally signed it—

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). When you were not under oath?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. My grounds for refusal is that I was not—will not bear witness against myself under the fifth amendment, and that under the first amendment the committee has no right to inquire into my political beliefs.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, were you acting in good faith, then, Mr. Polumbaum, when you accepted employment with a distinguished, outstanding organization such as the United Press, and answered this question in the fashion which you did?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Excuse me.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I always act in good faith.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you act in good faith in this instance?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. But you refuse to answer today under oath—

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). The same question.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I—I refused to answer the same question when it was earlier given to me—not exactly the same words, but it was a question of political affiliation—and I refuse to answer now on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, when asked not under oath, you will answer no; but when asked under oath, where there might be a possibility of perjury—

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Charges later brought, you refused to answer on the ground of the fifth amendment?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I am refusing to answer now on the grounds of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was the statement true when you made it originally, when you were first employed by the United Press?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That is asking me the same question about political affiliation.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was it true?

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You are asking me the same question.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you refusing to answer?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. And I am refusing to answer on the same grounds.

Mr. SCHERER. Well; when the United Press asked you those questions in the questionnaire, they were asking you questions at that time with reference to your political beliefs, were they not?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. The United Press is not a congressional investigating committee.

Mr. SCHERER. I understand that, but that wasn't my question. My question was if, when this question was asked you in the question-

naire by United Press, that wasn't a question with reference to your political beliefs.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That was a question between my employer and myself.

Mr. SCHERER. This is between your Government and yourself—this question that is being asked.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. This is a question between the committee, which is attempting to—

Mr. SCHERER. Right.

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). Infringe on my rights under the first and fifth amendments.

Mr. SCHERER. Was United Press attempting to infringe upon your rights when they wanted to know—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I haven't—

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Whether or not you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. The United Press was not attempting to infringe on my rights.

Mr. SCHERER. They were not attempting, but that was a question with reference to your political beliefs; wasn't it?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I will speak to my associates. I will tell my political beliefs to my associates, to my friend, and my family; but I will not—that is not interfering with my rights. I will do that willingly, and I waive no rights to do that; but in order to answer such questions before this committee, I would have to waive my rights.

Mr. SCHERER. You didn't feel that answering this question as far as United Press was concerned—

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. SCHERER (continuing). Was interfering with your political rights; did you?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I stated to you the United Press was not interested in violating my political rights and they were not interested in making me an informer, and they were not investigating political activities.

Mr. SCHERER. You realize if you had answered that question "Yes," United Press wouldn't have employed you, don't you?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Probably that's correct.

Mr. SCHERER. Probably that's correct.

Mr. CLARDY. That is why you answered "No," isn't it?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CLARDY. Just a minute.

Mr. KUNZIG. Oh, I am sorry. I am very sorry, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. I asked if that wasn't why he answered the question—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I answered that question in a matter of good faith, in relations between my employer and myself.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have anything further, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time to offer in evidence Polumbaum Exhibit No. 1, which has been marked for identification as Polumbaum Exhibit No. 1.

Mr. VELDE. It will be admitted into evidence.

(The United Press Associations' application for employment by Theodore S. Polumbaum was received in evidence as Polumbaum Exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions to ask this witness, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Clardy.

Mr. CLARDY. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Scherer.

(No response.)

Mr. WALTER. No.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. I think I do, Mr. Chairman.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Mr. Chairman, I have a brief written statement.

Mr. VELDE. You say you have some questions?

Mr. PALUMBAUM. I would like to put it into the record.

Mr. VELDE. Just a minute. Mr. Doyle has some questions.

Mr. DOYLE. May I ask you this question, please, young man: I notice you are about 31 years of age—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Twenty-eight.

Mr. DOYLE. And I notice that you manifestly came to this committee this morning previously well prepared and your mind firmly made up as to what you would answer and the position you would take.

In asking you this question, I am not criticizing you. I want you to believe me. I am not criticizing the position you took—neither am I complimenting it, nor as man to man saying I think you took the right position. That is your personal matter.

But I wrote down here your language which I want to ask you about. You said: "To answer that question would be to cooperate with this committee."

You said: "This committee has no right to ask me these questions."

Now, on that matter only I think you, as a young man, ought to have it impressed upon you at this time—I am trying to do it helpfully to you, as a young American citizen—that under Public Law 601, back in 1945 your Congress, your own Congress, your own United States Congress, authorized this committee and delegated to this committee an investigation of subversive activities in your country, the United States of America.

Now, our assignment, therefore, is to investigate subversive activities wherever found—whether in the Communist Party or any other totalitarian outfit.

Noticing that you did come apparently determined to not cooperate with this committee on anything—

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That's not true, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then—all right—not to cooperate with this committee on investigating the Communist Party.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. In prying into my political beliefs and associations, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. I am not asking you now as to your political associations and beliefs. I am not going to ask you in this question anything about the Communist Party.

I am trying to see if I can get a common basis with you, as a young American, to see if I can get your help, to see if you can help this committee, only in the field of subversive activities that may exist in this Nation.

Now, that is all I am going to ask you about.

Are you aware of any group in this Nation which, in your judgment, is functioning in the area of subversive activities in this Nation?

Do you understand my question?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, I am asking you, as one Member of your Congress, who was officially assigned to do this committee work, that frank question, as an American man to an American man.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I can answer it this way, sir: That if I knew of any illegal conspiratorial activities—activities of espionage or traitorous activities—punishable under the law—I would give such testimony to the proper authorities——

Mr. DOYLE. Well——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. But I believe in—in stating that it is investigating subversive activities this committee has infringed upon the rights of individuals to have their own political beliefs, their own private political beliefs, and associations, and not to reveal these political beliefs and associations.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Now, let me ask you this.

Let me just take 1 minute more, Mr. Chairman.

I noticed—I couldn't help but notice—that you didn't answer my question. I asked you as to subversive activities. I didn't ask you about any illegal conspiracy.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I mean——

Mr. DOYLE. Just 1 minute before you answer this again.

I am using the exact language of Public Law 601—and that is the authority under which we are assigned to investigate.

Now, are you aware of any group in this country that is subversive in its objectives and intent?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I have——

Mr. DOYLE. If you are, will you help——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I have——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Us by telling us what group it is?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I have—to my knowledge, I have no knowledge, through my associations and through my activities, of any group of persons who are engaged in illegal activities.

Mr. DOYLE. No; I am not asking you about illegal activities.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Are you asking me——

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you about subversive activities.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). That is the language——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. What do you mean by subversive activities?

Mr. DOYLE. Sir?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. What do you mean by subversive activities?

Mr. DOYLE. Oh, I think you and I would agree on a definition—to destroy, to dissolve. That is the general meaning of subversive.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, wouldn't subversive mean that such persons are—or organizations are—punishable and can be prosecuted under the laws against espionage and treason, and so on?

Mr. DOYLE. I am not drawing——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. And I don't——

Mr. DOYLE. I am not drawing any legal conclusions.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I believe the heritage of this country is complete freedom of political thought, to dissent way over to the wide left, and what this committee might consider subversive, or even illegal—it is just a question of this committee's disagreeing, disapproving of these activities.

Mr. DOYLE. No; not at all—and I just wanted to get to that point with you, because I assumed from your very positive, emphatic statement that that was your belief.

Now, what I would like to do at this time, if I may, in just one word, is to disabuse your mind, as far as I can, if I can, of your conclusion.

I think, young man, you are testifying before this committee under an erroneous premise. This committee is not interested in destroying any other person's political belief, nor are we interested in punishing or having punished any person for political beliefs.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I think——

Mr. DOYLE. I agree with you, or—may I state it more emphatically than you did—I think that America is great in no small measure because we do have, and in our history have had, people who dissented.

Mr. SHUBOW. Very good, Congressman.

Mr. DOYLE. I will agree with you, and I think that is the strength of our Nation in no small way; but when we come to the point of subversive organizations, or people who are subversive, those who would destroy the very constitutional premises of our own Government, then I, as one of your Congressmen, because I am your Congressman—I am a United States Congressman—don't think any person in America should have the freedom to go to the extent of actively participating in what you call conspiratorial activities.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I agree with you, sir. I think that the laws of this land protect the Government——

Mr. DOYLE. All right, now——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. From illegal conspiracy.

Mr. DOYLE. Our courts have defined, as I know you well know—I can tell it from the language you have used; I can see you are well informed, and I want to compliment you on informing yourself because you could be very helpful to your own Congress and your own Government in the field of helping your own Government uncover people who would destroy our constitutional basis of Government.

Now, those are the people we are after. We are not after uncovering people who merely dissent, unless their dissent goes to the point of forceful destruction.

Now, can you help us with that statement by me——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In the field of subversive groups? Do you know of any?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I know of no groups.

Mr. DOYLE. Do you know of any individuals——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Or——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Whom you consider as dangerous?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Or, to my knowledge, I know of no groups of individuals who are engaged in any activities for the illegal overthrow or destruction of the institutions of this country; and if I did I would feel it my duty to inform on these people, but I—I actually believe that this committee itself is infringing on the Bill of Rights, is undermining—is undermining the Bill of Rights.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then, let me ask you this one concluding question: If you were a member of this committee, assigned to do this job, which we have been assigned to do under Public Law 601, you would sit on this committee and function, wouldn't you, and try to uncover subversive people and subversive groups?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I would try to get all the information I could about illegal, treasonable activities, or conspiracies——

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you know——

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). Against the institutions of this country; but I would not—I would not subject innocent people to this sort of inquisition which damages their reputation and damages their employment.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you would subject people whom we have reason to believe are able to help us because they have been or were now members of the Communist Party——

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Which has been defined by the Government as subversive, wouldn't you?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, such people—I believe if there is evidence it should be presented to the proper authorities: these people should be brought before a grand jury, under the procedure——

Mr. DOYLE. But under the law—and this is the last point I want to make with you, young man—this is one of the proper authorities, the very committee you are talking with now, and that is what I wanted to make clear with you—that you in a meeting of this committee are meeting with the duly constituted official authority, constituted by the United States Government.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, if this committee has any evidence, it should go to a grand jury and present this evidence to the grand jury.

Mr. DOYLE. No; we are not a grand jury.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. It should go——

Mr. DOYLE. We are trying to uncover whether or not the John Reed Club, which you had knowledge—I don't know the extent of your knowledge, but that is what we are asking you to help us with—we believe from our information, under oath, that the John Reed Club was a subversive group. We believe also that you were a member of it.

Now, we are not——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, sir——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). You see——

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). If you have evidence that the John Reed group is engaged in or has engaged in a conspiracy to undermine the institutions of this Government, then if this is not merely a political question, but a question of legality, a question of—a question that can be prosecuted, you should present this evidence to the proper authorities.

Mr. DOYLE. No; we are not trying to trap anyone, or lay a trap to prosecute anyone; but I am asking a question now—and I am not asking you for a political belief—concerning information that we have, under oath, that the objectives of the John Reed Club, of which you had knowledge, were subversive.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You mean——

Mr. DOYLE. Now, then——

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). Can't be prosecuted under the law?

Mr. DOYLE. I am not saying anything about prosecution.

This is not a court. This is not a jury.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I believe subversive persons and subversive organizations should be prosecuted if there is evidence to warrant the prosecution.

Mr. CLARDY. But you won't help us do it?

Mr. DOYLE. Well, let me finish my question.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I am aware of no illegal conspiracies or organizations.

Mr. CLARDY. Not even the Communist Party?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. If this committee has evidence that the Communist Party has defied laws engaging in an illegal conspiracy to overthrow the Government, then this committee should not call on me but should present this evidence to a grand jury and let the grand jury call any further witnesses it wants, in secret, so that——

Mr. DOYLE. Well——

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). So that persons' reputations won't be, you know, exposed to public——

Mr. DOYLE. My last question to you is this: As I have stated, we have under oath evidence, testimony, that hasn't been contradicted, by the way, that the John Reed group was subversive in its objectives. Now, we have information also under oath that you were a member of that group.

Now, I am not saying you were subversive, young man. I am saying that our information is that that group, in its objectives, was subversive.

I am assuming, for the purposes of this question, that you were a member of that group. If you were, were the objectives of that group subversive, when you were in it——

Mr. POLUMBAUM. If the objectives——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). If you were?

Mr. POLUMBAUM (continuing). If the objectives—I'll repeat—if the objectives of the John Reed club, or any other group, were subversive, in the sense that they violated the laws of our land and violated the rights—violated the laws of our land—the Government has a right to protect itself, and I am sure it will.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, then, your answer now helps me to understand the extent to which you made up your mind you would go when you came into this room and when you said, "I refuse to cooperate with this committee," and I regret it very much, young man, because some young men about your age gave their lives in the uniform of their country——

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I was ——

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). To give you the very chance you have—and I compliment you on the service you also rendered.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. And I would do it again.

Mr. DOYLE. But why, then, won't you help this congressional committee in uncovering where there are subversive people?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Because where this committee asks questions of political affiliations and asks me to be an informer——

Mr. DOYLE. I am not asking you anything about your political affiliations.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You have mentioned various organizations.

Mr. DOYLE. I am asking you if the objectives of the John Reed Club, in your opinion, were subversive.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). You stated you had knowledge of it.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. That— isn't that a question to get me to admit membership in this group and to reveal my political affiliation?

Mr. VELDE. I think that you should answer the question. It is very simply put and very understandable. There is no reason that you could possibly incriminate yourself by answering the question of the gentleman, and I so direct you to answer the question.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I refuse—

Will you repeat the question, please?

Mr. DOYLE. I will ask the reporter to read the question.

(The reporter read the question as follows:)

I am asking you if the objectives of the John Reed Club, in your opinion, were subversive.

(At this point Mr. Polumbaum conferred with Mr. Shubow.)

Mr. POLUMBAUM. To the best of my knowledge, I knew of no organization, including the John Reed Club, which was engaged in subversive activities, defining "subversive" meaning an illegal conspiracy to overthrow the institutions of this Government.

Mr. CLARDY. That definition includes the Communist Party?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. All.

Mr. CLARY. What is that?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. All.

Mr. CLARDY. Then you include it?

(No response.)

Mr. VELDE. Do you have anything further?

Mr. DOYLE. Now, may I ask you this question, young man, in closing—and again I am not going to ask you any more than this one question. It will help us to understand what knowledge you have in giving this answer, whether or not it was personal knowledge or hearsay, whether or not your knowledge is based upon knowledge gained by you during the time you were a member of the John Reed Club, if you were.

Now, I have told you frankly we have evidence under oath that you were and, therefore, I feel this is a fair question and would help us to understand the extent to which our information is accurate, if we know the basis on which you testified.

Mr. POLUMBAUM. You haven't asked the question yet, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. DOYLE. Yes. That leads me to this question: Was your answer to my question based upon personal knowledge when—if you were—you were a member of the John Reed group?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. Well, in asking that question, you are asking me to reveal my political affiliation, and I decline to answer that question on the grounds I have stated.

Mr. DOYLE. In other words, the John Reed group was a political group, and on that basis you refuse to answer?

Mr. POLUMBAUM. I refuse to answer on the grounds I have stated.

Mr. DOYLE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Frazier?

Mr. FRAZIER. No questions.

Mr. VELDE. I would like to make a statement for the record, for the public, and for the press.

We have had a number of witnesses who have stood on their constitutional rights in refusing to answer questions, witnesses who were engaged in what we believe to be subversive activities in various fields, or American free institutions, labor, education, and I want to say that the testimony of this witness this morning should in no way lead to any conclusion that the Yale University or the United Press Association is anything more than completely patriotic.

It so happens that this witness was called this morning to testify relative to subversive activities in the field of education. It was later discovered that he was presently employed by United Press.

I want to emphasize again that we believe that the Yale University and all of our educational institutions and that United Press are entirely patriotic, very worthwhile institutions, performing a great function in the United States, and a patriotic function, I may add.

Is there any reason why this witness should be continued——

Mr. KUNZIG. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Under subpoena?

Mr. KUNZIG. We are through with this witness, as far as I know.

Mr. VELDE. The witness is dismissed, and the committee will stand in recess until 2:30.

(Whereupon, at 12:47 p. m., the hearing was adjourned until 2:30 p. m., the same day.)

COMMUNIST METHODS OF INFILTRATION (Education—Part 3)

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1953

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING

The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10:50 a. m., in the caucus room, room 362, Old House Office Building, Hon. Harold H. Velde (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Representatives Harold H. Velde (chairman), Clyde Doyle and James B. Frazier, Jr. (appearance noted in transcript).

Staff members present: Robert L. Kunzig, counsel; Frank S. Tavenner, Jr., counsel; Louis J. Russell, chief investigator; Raphael I. Nixon, director of research; and Donald T. Appell, investigator.

Mr. VELDE. The committee will come to order.

Let the record show I have appointed a subcommittee of the full committee consisting of Mr. Doyle of California and the chairman, Mr. Velde, for the purposes of this hearing.

Mr. Counsel, proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Martin—William Ted Martin—would you step forward, please, with your counsel?

Mr. VELDE. Would you remain standing and be sworn, please.

In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Dr. MARTIN. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Be seated.

Dr. Martin, are you represented by counsel and, if so, will counsel state his name and address for the record?

Mr. RAND. My name is Stuart C. Rand. I am an attorney at law, partner in the law firm of Choate, Hall, & Stewart—my first name is S-t-u-a-r-t, for the record—and my office is at 30 State Street in Boston.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thank you, Mr. Rand.

I believe you have already told me you are before this committee as a counsel for the first time. As I have already explained to you, you may confer at any time, of course, with your client and discuss matters with him; but it is the custom in the procedure before the

committee that the attorney not make speeches or comments of his own before the committee.

Mr. RAND. Thank you, sir.

TESTIMONY OF DR. WILLIAM T. MARTIN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, STUART C. RAND

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor, would you state your full name and present address?

Dr. MARTIN. William T. Martin, 16 Swan Lane, Lexington, Mass.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give that lane again?

Dr. MARTIN. Swan, S-w-a-n.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present position?

Dr. MARTIN. Professor of mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you head of the mathematics department?

Dr. MARTIN. I am the head of the mathematics department.

Mr. KUNZIG. At MIT?

Dr. MARTIN. At MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born?

Dr. MARTIN. Springdale, Ark., June 4, 1911.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you outline for the committee your educational background, studies, and so forth?

Dr. MARTIN. I studied in the public schools of Springdale, Ark., received my undergraduate training at the University of Arkansas, my graduate training at the University of Illinois.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were the years of this various training?

Dr. MARTIN. The bachelor's degree was received in 1930; the master's in 1931; the doctor's degree in 1934.

Mr. VELDE. Which one from the University of Illinois?

Dr. MARTIN. The master's and doctor's. I was there from 1930 until 1934.

Mr. VELDE. It is a good school.

Dr. MARTIN. I agree.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you outline for the committee your occupational background—your employment?

Dr. MARTIN. After the doctor's, or before?

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, from the time you left school, let's say.

Dr. MARTIN. I had 2 years of postdoctoral fellowships at Princeton and at the Institute for Advanced Study, 1934 to 1936; from 1936 to 1943 at MIT, except for one leave, 1 year on leave; from 1943 to 1946 at Syracuse University; since 1946, MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you become chairman of the mathematics department at MIT?

Dr. MARTIN. 1947.

Mr. KUNZIG. 1947—and you have been so continuously until the present time?

Dr. MARTIN. Except for a year on leave, the last year,

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Now, Dr. Martin, have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes; I have.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state when and under what circumstances you became a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I joined the Communist Party around January 1938, within a month or—few months either way. I don't recall the exact date.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you leave the party, if you did leave the party?

Dr. MARTIN. I left the party in the summer of 1946.

Mr. KUNZIG. Summer of 1946.

Now, what were the reasons that led to your joining the Communist Party? As an educated man, a mathematician, what led you to become a member of the party?

Dr. MARTIN. During the 1930's, I became very much concerned about the unemployment which existed for many people and I was hoping to do something that would improve the lot of people who didn't have quite such fortunate circumstances. I was also concerned about some discrimination which existed at that time, and I thought I would associate with a group of people who seemed to be interested in talking about these matters and trying to improve them.

Mr. KUNZIG. More than just talking—trying to do something about improving them?

Dr. MARTIN. Trying to do something.

Mr. KUNZIG. Since you mentioned discrimination, do you feel today that the Communist Party is attempting to improve problems in the realm of discrimination?

Dr. MARTIN. I do not.

Mr. KUNZIG. It is probably just the opposite; wouldn't you say?

Dr. MARTIN. I think so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Martin, has the mathematics department of M. I. T. engaged in research for the United States Government under contracts classified as secret or top secret, within your knowledge?

Dr. MARTIN. Individuals within the department have. I don't think you would say the department itself has.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever acted as a research or principal researcher on contracts for the Government—you, personally?

Dr. MARTIN. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever done any work for the United States Government or any government?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you tell the committee what that was?

Dr. MARTIN. I served very briefly as a consultant during the Army specialized training program, and I served very briefly—

Mr. KUNZIG. What time? Give the dates, if you would, please.

Dr. MARTIN. The dates on that were around 1943 or 1944.

Mr. KUNZIG. During the time that you were a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct. And I served very briefly as a member of the War Labor Board, public member of the War Labor Board.

Mr. KUNZIG. Also during—

Mr. VELDE. Of the War Labor Board?

Dr. MARTIN. War Labor Board.

Mr. KUNZIG. What period of time was that?

Dr. MARTIN. Around 1944 or 1945, I believe.

Mr. KUNZIG. Also during the time when you were a member of the party?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did the Government at that time ask you whether you were a member of the party, or any official of the Government ask you whether you were a member of the party?

Dr. MARTIN. No; not to my knowledge.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was there any questioning or background check to your knowledge made of you before you received those positions?

Dr. MARTIN. I'm not certain of that.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't know?

Dr. MARTIN. I do not know.

Mr. VELDE. If I may interrupt a minute, Mr. Counsel—

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Will you tell us briefly how you happened to become employed as a public panel member of the War Labor Board? Did you have special training in labor-management relations?

Dr. MARTIN. I did not; and, as I recall, I served only on one hearing in the entire time.

Mr. VELDE. Well, who approached you to join or to become a public panel member for that purpose?

Dr. MARTIN. I think there were several people from the university who just received official documents, or official letters, asking if they would be willing to serve, and I served without compensation for the one hearing I had.

Mr. VELDE. I see.

Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you ever been denied clearance to work on secret or confidential work for the Government, to your knowledge?

Dr. MARTIN. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Martin, in 1951 this committee had as a witness before it Prof. Dirk J. Struik—that is, D-i-r-k J. S-t-r-u-i-k—who at the time of his appearance was a professor of mathematics at MIT. Dirk Struik refused to answer the committee's questions under the protection of the fifth amendment, especially those questions relating, of course, to the membership in the Communist Party.

Now, do you have any knowledge prior to Dirk Struik's appearance before this committee that he was at that time or any time affiliated with the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I have information that he was at one time a member. I do not know about that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew him as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. How did you know him as a member of the party?

Dr. MARTIN. I attended meetings which he attended.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where were those meetings held, Professor?

Dr. MARTIN. In people's houses.

Mr. KUNZIG. What people's houses?

Dr. MARTIN. The people who were members at that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you name the names of the people, please, at whose houses you attended meetings of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I attended, I think, probably some at Professor Levinson, Prof. Norman Levinson, Professor Amdur—

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor, what was that last name?

Dr. MARTIN. Professor Amdur.

And possibly—I do not recall whether we met at Professor Struik's house or not.

Mr. VELDE. This was over what period of time, Doctor?

Dr. MARTIN. This was in the period around—from the time I joined, around 1938, up until 1943.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that Amdur—A-m-d-u-r—Prof. Isadore Amdur?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Both Professors Amdur and Struik are still at MIT—

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that correct?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. As a matter of fact, they are here in this room with you today?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, let's go back to the time when you first became a member of the party. To what cell or unit or group did you belong?

Dr. MARTIN. I belonged to a group which consisted of people at MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, you are testifying, then, that there was a cell or group right at MIT?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, there was a group of people who belonged, who also were at MIT, and met at their houses.

Mr. KUNZIG. In teaching capacities at MIT?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, did you stay a member of that group or did you join any other group of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I was in other groups from time to time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could you tell us of those other groups? What were their names, if they had any?

Dr. MARTIN. At one time—and I don't recall just when that was, after, say, 1938—a larger group got together and met, which consisted of some people from MIT, I believe some from Harvard.

Mr. KUNZIG. A larger group in the Boston area; is that correct?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Some from MIT, some from Harvard?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were the names of some of the people with whom you associated as Communists in that group?

Dr. MARTIN. In that group, Wendell H. Furry—

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the same Wendell H. Furry who testified here twice a few days ago?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor at Harvard?

Dr. MARTIN. Professor at Harvard—associate professor at Harvard.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know him to be a Communist or to have been a Communist at the time you were?

Dr. MARTIN. I know him to have been one back in those days; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. He was one of the leaders of the group, wasn't he?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't recall him being a leader.

Mr. KUNZIG. What others besides Dr. Wendell Furry?

Dr. MARTIN. I'll have to try to recall a few—

Mr. KUNZIG. Certainly.

Dr. MARTIN. Recall what names I can there.

I do not recall whether I met with Mr. Leo Hurvich or not, but I have the impression he was a Communist at that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the Leo Hurvich that testified here yesterday—

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Before this committee?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, what other members were there of your first group, the MIT group? You mentioned Dr. Dirk Struik, Levinson, Amdur.

Dr. MARTIN. Lawrence Arguimbau.

Mr. KUNZIG. Arguimbau?

Dr. MARTIN. I will not try to spell it.

Mr. KUNZIG. A-r-g-u-i-m-b-a-u. Is he still a professor at MIT?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe he is an associate professor.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you knew him as a Communist Party member at that time you were a member?

Dr. MARTIN. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Arguimbau, I would like to announce at this time, was before this committee in executive session within the last 2 days and will, in all probability, be recalled for further testimony. Now, did you know an Israel Halperin—H-a-l-p-e-r-i-n?

Dr. MARTIN. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. How long did you know Israel Halperin and what was your association with him?

Dr. MARTIN. I knew him first when he was in Princeton, when I was there, and as a fellow mathematician. I knew him later at Cambridge when he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. And you knew him as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I knew him as a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, were there any others in your MIT group, Dr. Martin?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe there was a man named B. E. Blaisdell.

Mr. KUNZIG. How do you spell Blaisdell?

Dr. MARTIN. B-l-a-i-s-d-e-l-l.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know the present whereabouts of Mr. Blaisdell?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't know where he is. He left many years ago—left Cambridge.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was his position at MIT at that time?

Dr. MARTIN. I think he had a rather minor position that did not involve teaching.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were there any other members that you recall of your MIT group?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe Dr. A. M. Gelbart—G-e-l-b-a-r-t.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any others?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't recall others at the moment.

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Martin, do you possess any knowledge of the operation of the Communist Party in the city of Boston as it relates to professional individuals, such as doctors, lawyers, teachers?

Dr. MARTIN. I think not.

Mr. KUNZIG. At the time you were a member, of course, I mean.

Dr. MARTIN. Oh, at the time I was a member. Well, I've described—

Mr. KUNZIG. Could you go into more detail and explain just what the function of the party was in Boston, what the function of professionals were within the party?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, the groups which—groups of people whom I knew were devoting themselves to mainly discussion and to—of these things which I said led me into the party, and to trying to support liberal legislation which would further that general end.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is your total knowledge of the work of the Communist Party—

Dr. MARTIN. There was—

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). Among professionals in the Boston area?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, there was also discussion of organizations which would work along the same line I mentioned, and there were from time to time discussions of something like a boycott of Nazi Germany or—

Mr. KUNZIG. I am glad you mentioned Nazi Germany. Now, I presume you detest any such form of totalitarianism as nazism and the actions of Hitler at the time he was in charge of Germany?

Dr. MARTIN. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Then how do you explain your being a member of the Communist Party during the period of the Nazi-Russian pact when Stalin and Hitler were allied?

You remained a member of the party during that period of time?

Dr. MARTIN. I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. Could you explain how you were able to do that and still remain true to what ideals you may have had with regard to—

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I didn't feel a very close relationship the whole period. In fact, it seemed rather confused to me and, as I look right now, it seems more confused and probably somewhat more stupid that I remained in at that time; but I certainly didn't see a direct connection there.

Mr. VELDE. Well, Doctor, at that time you were aware of the fact that the American Communist Party was a subsidiary or part and parcel of the Soviet or the great Comintern?

Dr. MARTIN. I never thought anything of that sort, Mr. Velde.

Mr. VELDE. You didn't?

Dr. MARTIN. I did not.

Mr. VELDE. In other words, you thought at that time the American Communist Party was a political organization, as you have mentioned—

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Is that it—

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). To help individuals who were in distress and to prevent discrimination?

Dr. MARTIN. That is what I thought.

Mr. VELDE. When did you first become aware of the fact that that was a misconceived notion?

Dr. MARTIN. Actually somewhat after I left the party, as I began to read the reports in the newspaper and notice the reports of trials and various reports by Government bodies. It was fear of activity which I did not see personally when I was in.

Mr. VELDE. Well, I would like to have you, in line with counsel's questioning, if you can remember some particular meeting of your cell that you attended, describe for the committee what took place in a particular meeting that you might have been interested in.

Dr. MARTIN. Well, frequently there would be a discussion of some philosophical topic that—by someone who had read it, and would discuss, give a little report on it; and then there might be a discussion of—if a few people, for instance, had some organizational activity outside, they might mention what they had been doing, and might discuss various points of legislation which had been considered, or something, and just things of that nature.

Mr. VELDE. Did you ever discuss the Communist Manifesto or the history of the Soviet Union?

Dr. MARTIN. Those were discussed. I don't know about the latter. I think the Manifesto was.

Mr. VELDE. Did you attend any meetings of your particular cell during and immediately before the time that Hitler marched on Stalin, or Germany marched on the Soviet Union?

Dr. MARTIN. I must have.

Mr. VELDE. Do you recall any of the discussions that took place at that time, immediately before and immediately afterwards?

I think that was 1941, wasn't it?

Mr. KUNZLE. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. June 1941.

Dr. MARTIN. Well, certainly before June 1941 there were discussions, hoping that United States would be able to remain at peace during this period, and I just happened to—during that summer I was on vacation some time—being after June—and wasn't in on discussions immediately; but when I did return, I remember discussions that it looked as though United States would be brought in—United States would more or less have to get into it.

Mr. VELDE. Was there any urging by the members of your particular cell after June of 1941 for the United States to get into the war on the side of Soviet Russia and other allies?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I think certainly a number of people felt that would be very nice, very good thing, for the United States to do.

Mr. VELDE. In other words, did you notice any change in the party line prior to June of 1941 and afterward? Did you notice a sudden change in what was being discussed by the members of your group and the decisions that were made?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, prior to June 1941, it was very clear that most of the people felt it would be—would prefer that the United States try to stay out of the conflict and keep it restricted, and there seemed to be an increasing awareness that would not be possible; and in the later months it—I think most people felt that it would have to eventually come.

Mr. VELDE. Yes.

Dr. MARTIN. It's a very confusing thing.

Mr. VELDE. There were a lot of good, patriotic Americans that had the same ideas; yet, I just wanted to bring that example out—

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE (continuing). As a shift in the party line of American Communist Party as directed by the Soviet Government.

Now, along that line, you were attending meetings in August of 1945, too?

I am speaking of the Duclos letter that was——

Dr. MARTIN. I believe I was around that time.

Mr. VELDE. And you became a member in——

Mr. DOYLE. 1938.

Mr. VELDE. 1938.

It was in 1943, wasn't it, when they changed to the Communist Political Association?

Dr. MARTIN. I became a member of the Communist Political Association when it was changed.

Mr. VELDE. And after VJ-day, I believe it was, do you recall anything about the discussion in your group concerning the Duclos letter?

Dr. MARTIN. There was some discussion at that time. I am not very clear on the date. There was some discussion of it. I had begun to lose somewhat my interest by that time, and was not—although I didn't formally leave for a while.

Mr. VELDE. Did any of the members of your particular cell leave the Communist Political Association at that time?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't recall anyone.

Mr. VELDE. After leaving the Communist Political Association, you, yourself, rejoined the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. For a brief time; yes.

Mr. VELDE. That would be under the direction of the Duclos letter?

That is what the Duclos letter advocated, you know——

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. That the Communist Political Association again returned to a militant, fighting organization and be called the Communist Party of America or the Communist Party of the United States.

Did you carry a card after the Communist Political Association was dissolved and returned to the——

Dr. MARTIN. I feel certain—quite certain—I did not.

Mr. VELDE. You did not?

Dr. MARTIN. I feel quite certain I did not, although I considered myself a member for a short while.

Mr. VELDE. I see.

And you say you got out in 1946?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. What were the circumstances of your leaving the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, there weren't any very particular ones. I had, I say, over a period of time become less and less interested and more bored with it, and felt that much of certainly the things which I had gone in did not seem to be—being accomplished, and I felt a great part of it was boring and parts of it were stupid, plain stupid, and I just left.

Mr. VELDE. Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to go back just a bit to completing the names in your MIT group. You mentioned this Gelbart. Do you know the present whereabouts of Mr. Gelbart?

Dr. MARTIN. Mr. Gelbart is at Syracuse University now.

Mr. KUNZIG. As a professor?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes; that is right, on the faculty.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Mr. Grossenbacher—G-r-o-s-s-e-n-b-a-c-h-e-r?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes; I recall Mr. Grossenbacher.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is his full name, if you know?

Dr. MARTIN. I think his first name was Carl. I don't remember the last one.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes; I did.

Mr. KUNZIG. When you were a member?

Dr. MARTIN. I did not think of that group earlier.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he in your MIT group or in the broader group?

Dr. MARTIN. He was in the broader group.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he a teacher or professor, or what was his position?

Dr. MARTIN. He had some staff position, I believe, at Harvard. I have a feeling it was a rather minor position.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know where he is today?

Dr. MARTIN. I do not.

Mr. KUNZIG. While we are talking about this broader group, can you remember any of the names of people who were in the broader group that you met with as Communists?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe a Mr. John H. Reynolds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know what his position was at that time?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't recall his exact position. It was some—again, I believe—minor position at Harvard.

Mr. KUNZIG. Minor position at Harvard?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know where he is today?

Dr. MARTIN. I think he's at one of the—I think he may be in Florida at one of the universities, but I am not sure of the precise one.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Hugh Dowker—D-o-w-k-e-r?

Dr. MARTIN. I knew him personally. I don't believe I ever met with him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party, whether or not you met with him?

Dr. MARTIN. I can't say that with absolute certainty.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Henry Wallman?

Dr. MARTIN. I knew him personally and scientifically.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. Not by actually meeting with him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you now feel that he was a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I feel he was for a short while. I also feel rather certain that he left very early in my career.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Mr. Herbert Philbrick?

Dr. MARTIN. To the best of my knowledge, I never have met Mr. Philbrick.

Mr. KUNZIG. Herbert Philbrick testified that Dr. Struik lectured the members of the Communist Party on the necessity of overthrow of the Government by force and violence, including imperialistic governments, as he said, such as the United States.

Now, do you know of any such activity or did you ever participate in any such activity?

Dr. MARTIN. To the best of my knowledge, I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have complaints of such activity on the part of Struik ever been brought to your attention as head of the mathematics department?

Dr. MARTIN. Those would not tend to come to me.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have heard of such complaints, though?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes; I've heard of such complaints.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know anything about it as head of the mathematics department?

Dr. MARTIN. No; that is really outside my domain.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see. Outside of your work?

Dr. MARTIN. As head of the department; that is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, the thing I think would interest the committee very greatly, if you could possibly explain to them in your attempt here to cooperate with the committee this morning, Doctor, is how you can account for what would seem to be an abnormally large percentage of Communists at MIT?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't know how to explain that, except the fact that when one person is in he may—if he commands respect of others, he may interest others in it, and—

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean that professors at a college or at a university commanding, as they do, the respect of students or other professors, if they were Communists, might tend to attract other students or professors to the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe I would tend to restrict that to the professors, but not to the students.

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean professors have no contacts with students?

Dr. MARTIN. That is not quite right. They have contact but during my association there was rather great care exercised on the part of professors not to try to influence students.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you feel that your interest as a Communist and as a top professor in the mathematics department might have accounted for other Communists coming in there or being there?

Dr. MARTIN. During my membership there at MIT I have a rather—I should emphasize I was rather young and did not have a very top position. That is when I was—

Mr. KUNZIG. It was later on you became—

Dr. MARTIN. It was later on I had the higher position.

I don't believe I was commanding a great deal of respect at that time.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, Professor Martin, your being in the Communist Party was a secret thing, was it not?

* Dr. MARTIN. It was not known widely. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Not known widely. Was it known by anybody except the other members of the Communist Party with whom you met?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe that is all.

Mr. KUNZIG. You didn't announce it publicly?

Dr. MARTIN. That is right; I did not announce it publicly.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have already talked about a card. Did you ever at any time use an alias in the party or have any other name in the party, as was apparently customary?

Dr. MARTIN. There may have been another name on the card, but I never really went by another name.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was there another name on the card?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe there was.

Mr. KUNZIG. So if, for example, there had been an investigation or if the FBI had raided the headquarters, or something of that nature, your name as William Ted Martin would not have come out or would not have been discovered?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe that is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any cards or papers or documents that were there would have been under that assumed name?

Dr. MARTIN. I suppose so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, why did you feel it necessary—and this I cannot understand, sir—if you were just a professor interested in philosophical discussions to better mankind and to do away with racial discrimination—for this tremendous secrecy?

Dr. MARTIN. I'll have to just try to reconstruct my thinking at the time. It's not—what it's been since—some of that seems very stupid now, but I will try to reconstruct.

Mr. KUNZIG. I realize this is some time ago.

Dr. MARTIN. Yes; but also now I feel it is stupid, but I will try to reconstruct.

In the first place, the secrecy was there when I joined. I mean I didn't feel I started the secrecy and I didn't feel called upon to try to change it—that is, I just accepted it—and it seemed to me from—since public opinion at that time clearly was not most favorable to this—that it might be wiser to keep it that way.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew that public opinion was not favorable?

Dr. MARTIN. I did; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Even at that time?

Dr. MARTIN. Even at that time.

Mr. VELDE. Well, I don't quite understand you there, Doctor. Public opinion was not in favor of what—what the Communist Party stood for?

Dr. MARTIN. There were from time to time in the papers criticisms of the Communist Party, and I felt—I feel that public opinion—I felt then and I feel now that public opinion would have been in favor of what I, myself, went in for and what I was trying to do, and what my acquaintanceship with the party was at that time.

Mr. VELDE. When was the last time you carried a Communist Party card or a Communist Political Association card?

Dr. MARTIN. The reason I hesitate—I don't know if I ever really carried a Communist Party card or Communist Political Association card. I don't recall ever—maybe the first year I was in, but certainly not very long—very little time, if any.

Mr. VELDE. You mean the first year you were in the Communist Party or the Communist Political Association?

Dr. MARTIN. No; the first year I was in the Communist Party. I may have had one; I don't recall.

Mr. VELDE. You don't recall whether you used your own name or another name on that particular card, if you—

Dr. MARTIN. I do not ever recall ever carrying the card; no.

Mr. KUNZIG. Doctor, didn't you realize, or do you realize today, that a famous and distinguished professor, such as yourself, at the top

of the mathematics department in a great institution, outstanding in that field, in itself, lends—and I choose the word carefully—dignity or impressiveness to the Communist Party itself just because you are part of it?

Dr. MARTIN. May I repeat that I did not have that position while I was a member and I did not consider myself a man—I mean——

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Dr. MARTIN (continuing). One of these men with prestige, great prestige.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, when you went to Syracuse for those 3 years prior to your leaving the party, were you a member of the party at Syracuse University?

Dr. MARTIN. I was a member while I resided in Syracuse.

Mr. KUNZIG. While you resided in Syracuse?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. That was as a member of the Communist Party in the City of Syracuse in contradistinction to that of Syracuse University?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were your Communist activities there in the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. They were very slight because I was very busy with my mathematics and my work, and during part of that time, as Mr. Velde has mentioned, the Communist Political Association was there. It was mainly again discussion at that time. There was considerable interest on my part in supporting the national effort toward the entire national defense effort there.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was your membership, so far as you know, in the Communist Party transferred along with you when you went up to Syracuse?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe not.

Mr. KUNZIG. From MIT?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe not.

Mr. KUNZIG. You joined again?

Dr. MARTIN. I didn't join. I think I eventually—well, transferred in the sense that I made the transfer myself. It was a voluntary thing.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Helen Deane Markham—M-a-r-k-h-a-m?

Dr. MARTIN. I have known her, just as a person.

Mr. KUNZIG. As a person.

Did you know her as a member of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever belong to any organization of individuals from which group Helen Deane Markham acted as either membership or financial secretary?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe the American Association of Scientific Workers. I was a member of that, and I believe she was in it. I don't recall knowing her other than through that organization.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you acquainted with an individual by the name of Norman Veall—V-e-a-l-l?

Dr. MARTIN. I do not recall meeting him.

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Martin, both Israel Halperin and Norman Veall were defendants in the Canadian spy trial. Both were, of course,

subsequently acquitted. Did you engage in the activity of raising funds for the defense of any of these people?

Dr. MARTIN. I made a contribution for the fund for Mr. Halperin.

Mr. KUNZIG. I see.

Why did you do that, so far as you may recall?

Dr. MARTIN. I had known him as a friend for several years and felt that he, in my acquaintanceship with him—that he was a person who would not knowingly do wrong, and I wanted him to have proper legal aid.

Mr. KUNZIG. That was in spite of the fact you knew him as a member of the Communist Party—

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). And the various trials were connected with Communist spies, and so forth?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, at that time, at the time I had known him, as I say, he seemed very much—a very sincere person, and I contributed money for his—so he could obtain proper legal counsel, which I felt would determine whether or not he—that is, give him a chance to see what the outcome was.

Mr. KUNZIG. Have you since reviewed the evidence or studied the evidence of those trials?

Dr. MARTIN. Not in great detail. I have seen some of it. I believe his—I believe he was acquitted or—

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes; I have already stated that.

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, to go back to Syracuse, would you give us the names of the members of the Communist Party with whom you sat in meetings and whom you knew as members of the Communist Party while you were in Syracuse, N. Y.?

Dr. MARTIN. There was a man named—I believe his last name was Putter—Norman Putter—I think P-u-t-t-e-r.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was his position at that time?

Dr. MARTIN. He was in some business—possibly a salesman.

Mr. KUNZIG. Any others?

Dr. MARTIN. And I—

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know where he is today?

Dr. MARTIN. I do not know where he is today. I haven't seen him for a number of years.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he an officer of your Communist group?

Dr. MARTIN. I think quite likely.

Mr. KUNZIG. What position, if you know?

Dr. MARTIN. He may have served. It seems to me he did, but I wasn't—I wouldn't say that with certainty.

And Mr. Gelbart, whom I mentioned earlier.

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes; you mentioned him earlier.

Any others?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't recall that group very well. You see, during part of the time there was a very large group that met in the association, the Communist Political Association, but I don't recall names very well. I tend to remember people whom I knew personally more than I do just—as vague ones.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now—

Mr. VELDE. Were these meetings you attended at that time what you would call closed meetings, closed to everybody except members of the Communist—

Dr. MARTIN. Some——

Mr. VELDE (continuing). Political Association?

Dr. MARTIN. Some were, and some were not, at that time.

Mr. VELDE. How large were the meetings which were closed to the general public?

Dr. MARTIN. I think those were only 4 or 5—something like that.

Mr. VELDE. That is, 4 or 5 at a time, but there may have been——

Dr. MARTIN. There may have been more in Syracuse, but I was not widely acquainted there.

Mr. KUNZIG. Dr. Martin, back to MIT, it is the committee's understanding that scholarships to MIT have been awarded to 2 sons of Earl Browder, and that 1 son, Felix Browder, was employed as a part-time or full-time instructor at MIT. Does that enliven your knowledge?

Dr. MARTIN. The latter does, about Felix Browder, and I assume the sons had scholarships; and they are, I believe, undergraduates, and that would not be handled directly by——

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you have any knowledge as to how it came about that Browder's sons were selected for scholarships, or anything of that nature?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, one of them is a very good student. He has an outstanding record, and I'm sure it was on the merits of his case.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know either of the Browder sons as members of the Communist Party?

Dr. MARTIN. I did not.

Mr. KUNZIG. That was at a later period after you were not a member; is that the point?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes; I believe I never met any of them until after I left, and I don't know they were ever members. In fact——

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, professor, we were talking a moment ago about MIT and about the names you have listed in the mathematics and other departments of MIT whom you knew as Communists. You mentioned, I believe 6 or 7. I don't, of course, mean to assume there were more at MIT than any other college or that MIT is different from any other, but can you explain what your viewpoint is as to whether Communists, present day Communists, should teach in schools or be professors in universities?

Dr. MARTIN. I think presently Communists should not teach in universities and be professors.

Mr. KUNZIG. If you were a college professor and had charge of appointing professors, would you appoint a Communist to the staff?

Dr. MARTIN. I would not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you appoint a Communist if you were in the lower schools, high school, or any other grade of school, where young children go?

Dr. MARTIN. I would not.

Mr. KUNZIG. And why do you feel that way, sir?

Dr. MARTIN. Because I feel there's too much conflict with what they feel and what they should be doing.

Mr. DOYLE. May I hear that answer again?

Dr. MARTIN. I feel there's too much conflict between what they might tend to feel and what they would be expected to do as teachers.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, you would apparently not feel that

Communists could maintain any sort of intellectual freedom or freedom to teach as they see fit?

Dr. MARTIN. I think it would be very difficult for a Communist today to do that.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Doyle, do you have some questions?

Mr. DOYLE. Referring to your answer a minute ago, professor, that you felt there might be too much of a conflict between what a Communist professor would feel in the classroom and what he was supposed to teach, what would he feel in the classroom as a Communist as a contradistinction to what he was supposed to teach as a professor?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I can—

Mr. DOYLE. Where is the conflict?

Dr. MARTIN. I can speak only from what I see in the papers and read today.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, I am asking you also to look back at your own experience.

Dr. MARTIN. I never felt any conflict.

Mr. DOYLE. You what?

Dr. MARTIN. I never felt any conflict at the time, because I did not feel the things I was interested in, the particular social problems which I was interested in, created any possible conflict; but—

Mr. DOYLE. But you were in the Communist Party 8 years?

Dr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. DOYLE. And after you got out of it you went back in it again, after the Communist Political Association was dissolved?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes; I believe that is part of the total—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, part—

Dr. MARTIN (continuing). Period.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Of the total?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. You must have had pretty strong feelings to stay in 8 years in a secret organization?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, as I say, my interest began to wane and I began to be much more bored about it much earlier.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, it took you a long time to get out.

Dr. MARTIN. It did.

Mr. DOYLE. I am being perfectly frank with you because you are a highly trained man.

Dr. MARTIN. But I'll be frank and say as I look back I don't know why it took me that long.

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., entered the hearing room at this point.)

Mr. DOYLE. Were you ever an officer in the MIT Communist cell, or whatever the name of it was? Were you ever chosen by your fellow Communists secretly to be an officer in that group?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't believe it was much—it was a small group, and I don't remember much in the way of—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, there must have been a chairman.

Dr. MARTIN. I don't recall ever being chairman of it.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever lead in the discussion? Were you ever assigned to discuss any of the subjects?

Dr. MARTIN. I probably was, but I don't recall about it.

MR. DOYLE. Well, now, think a minute, please. I am asking a direct question: Did you ever lead in the discussion of this MIT Communist cell?

DR. MARTIN. Well, I certainly must have given reports on something there, and——

MR. DOYLE. Well, did you?

I am trying to find out the extent of your activity in this Communist cell in which you stayed secretly 8 years.

DR. MARTIN. Well, I can recall talking about my general activities when I was, for instance, in the American Association of Scientific Workers, reporting on activities to bring people up to date on that. Yes; I can remember that.

MR. DOYLE. You said the thing that attracted you into this secret organization, which you knew was secret when you went into it, was the subject of liberal legislation, philosophical subjects, to prevent discrimination and interest in unemployment?

DR. MARTIN. That is correct.

MR. DOYLE. I presume before you joined the secret Communist Party you were a member of some other political party, and I am not asking you which one, but were you a registered voter before you went into the Communist Party?

DR. MARTIN. I was previously, sometimes.

MR. DOYLE. I am not asking you which party, but at that time did you feel that whatever political party you were a member of was not active enough in the field of preventing discrimination and in the field of seeking to see that there was average employment in America?

DR. MARTIN. Well, I think everybody at that time—and I recognize that all groups were working toward that—I just happened to feel at that time that here was a group who seemed to be discussing it along the very lines that I thought would be effective, and I——

MR. DOYLE. Well, wasn't your own political party working along the same line?

DR. MARTIN. It was.

MR. DOYLE. Well, why did you leave it, then?

DR. MARTIN. I can only say that I felt probably I could be more effective with this other group, as I—it's hard to think back now, particularly since I think that was a mistake, that I thought that; but I can try to reconstruct and say I thought that.

MR. DOYLE. I think our distinguished counsel did not take time to ask you who invited you into the Communist Party. Who did invite you? How did you happen to join?

DR. MARTIN. Well, I was—happened to have an apartment with a person who was a member and whom I respected, and we——

MR. DOYLE. Did you name that person for the benefit of the committee's study?

DR. MARTIN. I named him: yes. I don't know if he actually invited me, but we talked these things over and I came in as a result of that.

MR. DOYLE. Now, you mentioned Professors Amdur, Levinson, Arguimbau, Halperin, Blaisdell, Gelbart, and several others.

DR. MARTIN. That is correct.

MR. DOYLE. Do I understand all you distinguished men in education were members of the same Communist cell and met for a period of years in a secret outfit?

Dr. MARTIN. No. There were times when we were not in the same one, and also times when we did not meet together, and there was a change in it from time to time.

Mr. DOYLE. You mentioned that you discussed liberal legislation in this Communist cell. What liberal legislation did you discuss as a secret Communist member? What liberal legislation?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I—

Mr. DOYLE. Did you discuss any at the national level?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes. I seem to recall there was discussion when social security went in. There was a discussion of the proposed social-security bills.

Mr. DOYLE. And was that the only liberal legislation?

Dr. MARTIN. No. There were more. I'll try to think of more. I'm certain there was discussion of—I don't remember just what occurred when, but of various labor acts, and so on, that is, acts of that sort.

Mr. DOYLE. That was not very extensive discussion, then; was it?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, after a short while the war came along and United States was in the war, and I—

Mr. DOYLE. You say you discussed other organizations interested in the same things. What other organizations did you discuss that were interested in the same thing?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I—the American Association of Scientific Workers had some of these interests—not all—and I discussed things that organization was doing.

Mr. DOYLE. You said you discussed philosophical subjects. What philosophical subjects?

Dr. MARTIN. There was discussion of Marxist literature.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you read Marxist literature?

Dr. MARTIN. I read some.

Mr. DOYLE. How early in your experience in the secret outfit did you begin to read Marxist literature? The first year?

Dr. MARTIN. I imagine the first year.

Mr. DOYLE. How long did it take you to discover that the Marxist literature and theory, philosophically, was only totalitarian Soviet communism's scheme to rule the world, and that it should rule the world? When did you discover that, if you ever did?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I certainly feel it now.

Mr. DOYLE. When did you discover it?

Dr. MARTIN. I didn't think of it in that line at all when I was—

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you read it?

Dr. MARTIN. I read it. I was not very much interested in it, frankly.

Mr. DOYLE. If it seems as though I am cross-examining you, Professor—

Dr. MARTIN. Oh—

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). In a sense, I am, because I am amazed. Frankly, while I appreciate your coming and helping us, I am amazed that you and a number of men in this distinguished educational institution were members of a secret organization for several years. I could expect it from a lower level of privilege in America, but I am shocked—

Dr. MARTIN. Well, it seems—

Mr. DOYLE. And, yet, I—

Dr. MARTIN (continuing). Very stupid to me. I was younger and less mature, and I hope I am wiser than I was then.

Mr. DOYLE. How many members were in this MIT group?

Dr. MARTIN. I think I have named about the group—probably about 6 or 7 at the time.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever invite other people to join the cell?

Dr. MARTIN. Very rarely. I think I may have done so once or twice.

Mr. DOYLE. Your answer then is: Yes; you did?

Dr. MARTIN. My answer is, I did.

Mr. DOYLE. Several of them—more than 2 or 3?

Dr. MARTIN. No.

Mr. DOYLE. Did you ever go to any other Communist cell and lecture and speak?

Dr. MARTIN. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, now, think a minute.

Dr. MARTIN. I feel I never spoke before any other group.

Mr. DOYLE. Our distinguished chairman called your attention to the Duclos letter that I believe historically came to this country in about May 1945. Did you ever read the Duclos letter when it came?

Dr. MARTIN. I read it.

Mr. DOYLE. And what was your conclusion when you read it, as relates to the subject of whether or not the American system of free, competitive enterprise and the Soviet system could survive side by side in the world?

Dr. MARTIN. I felt they would survive side by side.

Mr. DOYLE. You felt they could?

Dr. MARTIN. I felt they could.

Mr. DOYLE. In spite of what the Duclos letter said?

Dr. MARTIN. Right now I do not recall what the Duclos letter said.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, Earl Browder was deposed shortly after that; wasn't he?

Dr. MARTIN. I believe he was.

Mr. DOYLE. Why was he deposed, if you have any opinion, or formed any opinion?

You had supported, hadn't you, his theory of communism in America during the time you were in the cell?

(Representative James B. Frazier, Jr., left the hearing room at this point.)

Dr. MARTIN. Yes, as far as I know.

Mr. DOYLE. Then if you stayed in the cell after he was deposed—am I in error?—you must have then concluded that the basis of the Duclos letter was sound, as far as you are concerned?

Dr. MARTIN. Would you mind giving me just a little résumé of that letter, which I am really very vague about now, before I try to answer that.

Mr. DOYLE. You read it. I am not going to try to refresh your memory.

Mr. VELDE. Well, Mr. Doyle—

Mr. DOYLE. In all fairness to you—

Dr. MARTIN. It's evident that letter did not make much of an impression.

Mr. DOYLE. All right.

Dr. MARTIN. I just assume I did, if I did, and it was clear I was beginning to leave the movement.

Mr. DOYLE. I will accept, then, as explanatory of the fact that it didn't seem to be too important to you at that time.

Now, I am going to ask you a few questions, Professor, which I think will be entirely different as I ask them now to you perhaps. I am asking you to jump over into the area of seeing if there is any advice, recommendation, or suggestion you can give this committee in our investigation.

This committee, as you know, operates under Public Law 601, passed by this Congress in 1945, and under that law we are assigned the duty of investigating subversive activities.

Of course, you know, generally speaking, the Communist Party has been held to be subversive by our courts. I mean members generally have been found guilty where they have been tried before American juries of being party to a conspiracy to violently and forcefully overthrow our form of government.

This committee, under that Public Law 601, is assigned the very heavy duty of trying to find out the facts, which will come back to the United States Congress to help it to more intelligently legislate. In other words, that perhaps is our main objective—to recommend legislation.

Now, growing out of your experience of 8 years—whatever it was—have you any suggestion to us in the area of legislation?

You got out of the party voluntarily in 1946. Something caused you to get out. I will not take the time of you or the committee now to ask you what caused you to get out more in detail, but what about legislation?

You are a trained man in education, one of the top men in our country, in your own field.

Dr. MARTIN. I would like to be a little more modest in that, on my standing; thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, any man who is the top of the mathematics department in MIT or any man who has the privilege of teaching there, in my humble opinion, is one of the trustees of American security and American safety.

Dr. MARTIN. Thank you.

Mr. DOYLE. Now, have you any suggestion to us in the field of legislation?

Dr. MARTIN. That's so far afield from where I feel I have any way of speaking with any authority, I just feel I couldn't make any suggestion on that.

Mr. DOYLE. Was this committee ever discussed in the Communist meetings which you attended, or any congressional investigating committee in the field?

Did you ever discuss the functioning of this committee?

Dr. MARTIN. I don't recall discussing that.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, you were subpoenaed to come before this committee?

Dr. MARTIN. I was, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Again, I want to thank you for doing what you have; but why don't more men in your class—why don't more educated schoolmen—who were formerly in the field, formerly members of the Communist Party, even before the Ducloux letter, 1945—why is it more

men of your type, instead of waiting to be subpoenaed, don't come forward in executive session or offer off the record to come and help Congress be better qualified and fitted to do its fullest duty?

Why is it you hold back until you are subpoenaed?

If you felt it was wise to get out of the conspiracy, what is it that holds you men back from coming forward voluntarily?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, it's just a very difficult decision to make and one that one does not arrive at easily. It has to be a subject that one thinks about and finally arrives at that decision within himself—what he feels the best procedure is.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, when you get out of the Communist Party, you feel there is something inconsistent in the objectives of that party as contrasted to the safety and welfare of your own Nation, don't you? That is one of the impelling motives that gets you out of it?

Dr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. DOYLE. Well, why, then, with that impelling motive, strong enough to get you out of that conspiracy, don't men of your type voluntarily come forward in the interests of the security of our own Nation?

In other words, if you had the impelling motive to get out, because you became afraid of its objectives, as related to our own national security, why don't you have impelling motive enough to cause you to voluntarily help in the interests of our own national security?

Dr. MARTIN. Well, I certainly want to help in that.

I knew many of these people whom I've mentioned here today, of whom you have asked me, were, I felt—went in with what I felt were very sincere motives—that they have left long ago, and it is not easy to bring one's self to mention names; and some people whose names are mentioned, who may have left years ago, will experience difficulty as a result of that, and that is just not an easy conflict for a man to resolve within himself.

Mr. DOYLE. I realize that, Professor. I think every American does who is more devoted to our American way of life than to communism and Sovietism.

And may I say again if I have seemed to—

Dr. MARTIN. Oh, that is quite all right.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Cross-examine you in any sense at all, it is only because I wanted to more quickly put you in a position where you could see what I was after as a member of this committee—

Dr. MARTIN. That is quite all right.

Mr. DOYLE. To get the facts as quickly as possible from you.

Thank you very much.

Dr. MARTIN. Thank you, Mr. Doyle.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Dr. Martin, the Duclos letter was discussed very fully, and I noticed there was some doubt in your mind concerning the contents of the letter. I am no authority on the Duclos letter, I want you to understand, but generally it was a letter that was sent from the French Communist, who is now a leader of the French Communists, Jacques Duclos, to the American Communist Party, and it was—I am about to retract my statement—in May of 1945, instead of August of 1945 as I mentioned before. Generally, it directed the American Communist Party, or the then Communist Political Association, to disband as such and to reorganize as a militant, fighting organization,

fighting against capitalism, fighting against our free-enterprise system of economy, and fighting against our general political system.

There was a lot of discussion among various Communist Party groups in the United States at the time that letter was brought before their memberships. Some of the members of the Communist cells quit at that time because they finally realized that the American Communist Party was getting its instructions from Soviet Russia—and, with all the evidence before this committee and the other committees of Congress concerning the source of the Duclos letter, there isn't much question but what it came directly from the Soviet, from the Kremlin.

It was at that time, when the members of the Communist Party understood that, that a number of them quit.

Now, I think the question that the gentleman from California asked you was very proper—why, if you were aware of the source of this letter at that time, you didn't quit the party at that particular time.

Dr. MARTIN. I guess I wasn't very fully aware of that. The fact that I don't seem to recall much of it, as I say—I was certainly—my interest and activity were diminishing, but I must not have thought very much about that at that time.

Mr. VELDE. Were you ever familiar with an organization known as the FAECT, the Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians?

Dr. MARTIN. Very vaguely. It seems to me in the 1930's I once heard mention of it, but I don't recall any activity with it at all.

Mr. VELDE. You don't recall either at Syracuse or at MIT—

Dr. MARTIN. I do not recall—

Mr. VELDE (continuing). That organization?

Dr. MARTIN (continuing). At MIT such an organization.

Mr. VELDE. Well, Doctor Martin, you have cooperated with us and contributed a great deal to the committee's vast fund of information concerning subversive activities, Communist subversive activities, in the United States. I certainly do thank you for the attitude you display here.

It is my opinion that, as a result of your testimony, no inference should be drawn by the public, press or otherwise that MIT or Syracuse University is any more infiltrated with the Communist Party members than any of our great American institutions of learning.

As a matter of fact, I am sure the gentleman from California has always had the greatest respect for MIT and Syracuse University.

Mr. DOYLE. That is quite so.

Mr. VELDE. And we realize there are relatively few people, both as students and as professors and teachers, who have become entangled in the mesh of Communist intrigue.

It is with a view of determining to what extent the American Communist Party and Soviet Russia infiltrated our educational system that we are having these hearings, and we are glad to find out that it isn't as serious as a good many people would think.

However, we do feel that one Communist teacher in one of our great American universities at the present time can be very dangerous to our internal security. It is with that view in mind we are making these investigations.

Do you have anything further?

Mr. KUNZIG. Nothing further for this witness, sir.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I make this observation: I am sure you will agree with me—It is always a pleasure to find a distinguished American counsel to take time to come from a busy law practice to appear before this committee; and, as a member of the bar, I want to recognize that to have a distinguished, busy American counsel come from another city to come here is quite refreshing to the committee.

Mr. VELDE. And I will concur in that statement.

Mr. RAND. May I say I appreciate the expression by the members of the committee and, if I may, I would like to say I have talked a number of times very earnestly and at length in my office with Professor Martin and if I hadn't felt he wasn't entirely sincere, I wouldn't be here; and I appreciate the courtesies that the committee have extended to him, and the way he has been examined.

I wish I knew the answer, Congressman Doyle, to your question; but I'm afraid I don't, and I have served in the legislature, but never the Congress of the United States.

Dr. MARTIN. May I say a word?

Mr. VELDE. Certainly.

Dr. MARTIN. I would like to say Mr. Rand's faith and belief in me have helped me reach the conclusion I have reached and the decision to take this course of action.

I thank you.

Mr. VELDE. I hope and pray there are a lot more lawyers like Mr. Rand throughout this country.

The witness is excused, with the committee's thanks.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

Mr. VELDE. Do you have another witness?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. Zisel.

Mr. VELDE. In the testimony you are about to give before this subcommittee, do you solemnly swear you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ZISEL. I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Be seated, please.

Mr. VELDE. Let the record show at this point this is a continuance of the hearings this morning under the same subcommittee consisting of Mr. Doyle, from California, and the chairman, Mr. Velde.

The Chair would like to announce that any other witnesses who are called for this afternoon or for today may retire for lunch at the present time, if you care to do so, and we will continue after we hear this witness for a short time until 2:30 this afternoon.

Proceed, Mr. Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Zisel, if you are accompanied by counsel, would counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. COBB. Yes. My name is David Cobb—C-o-b-b—and I am a member of the bar of the District of Columbia, a member of the firm of Cobb and Weissbrodt, and our office is at 1822 Jefferson Place NW., here in the city.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Cobb, I understand this is the first time you have appeared before this committee, but I think, since you have been here this morning, you understand the rules regarding counsel and the position of counsel.

Mr. COBB. It is the first time I have appeared before the committee.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL RUDOLPH ZILSEL, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, DAVID COBB

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give your full name and address, please, Mr. Zisel?

Mr. ZISEL. Paul Rudolph Zisel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you spell Zisel?

Mr. ZISEL. Z, as in zebra, i-l-s-e-l; and the name of the town of Storrs, Conn.

Mr. KUNZIG. When and where were you born, Mr. Zisel?

Mr. ZISEL. I was born in Vienna, Austria, on May 6, 1923.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you come to this country?

Mr. ZISEL. In August 1939.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you become a citizen, if you are a citizen?

Mr. ZISEL. I am. I became a citizen in November 1945.

Mr. KUNZIG. When did you file your application for citizenship?

Mr. ZISEL. I'm afraid I can't recall that exactly but I am under the impression that it was almost immediately after I arrived in this country. Wait a minute—I'm sorry—that can't be quite true, because I was under 18 at that time, and I think there is a regulation you can't do it until one is 18. So, it must have been when I was 18. I came with my parents. My parents filed application right away; but since I was between 16 and 18, I didn't file until I was 18.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a brief résumé of your educational background?

Mr. ZISEL. Yes, sir. I went to public school in the gymnasium, Vienna, Austria, left Vienna in September 1938, spent a year in England, where I went to what is called public school there, graduated from public school in England, and then came to this country, went to the College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C., where I got my bachelor's degree in 1943, then went to the University of Wisconsin as a graduate student in September 1943, interrupted my studies there for about 6 months, in the spring of 1944, after the death of my father, went back there in the fall of 1944, got my master's degree in 1945, transferred to Yale in January 1947, and received my doctor's degree from Yale in 1948.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the committee a brief résumé of your employment background?

Mr. ZISEL. After I left school, or all the way through?

Mr. KUNZIG. Let's say after you left school.

Mr. ZISEL. Well, after I left Yale, I had a postdoctoral fellowship at Duke University for a year, that is, from January 1948 to January 1949. I then was an assistant professor of physics at Colorado A. and M. College for a year, from January 1949 to January 1950, and since then I have been at the University of Connecticut continuously.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that where you are at the present time?

Mr. ZISEL. I am now an assistant professor of physics at the University of Connecticut; yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Zisel, have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ZISEL. I am not now a member of the Communist Party.

The second part of your question I will have to decline to answer on the grounds of the first and fifth amendments, and because to answer it would tend to degrade me.

I also would like to have it appear in the record that I am pleading the privilege of the fifth amendment because I do not want to be put into a position where I have to inform on people whom I consider to be perfectly innocent.

Mr. KUNZIG. The fifth amendment, you understand, has nothing to do with other people. It only refers to yourself. So, let's get that part straight. It is a privilege against incriminating yourself, a privilege against being required to testify against yourself. There is no law, so far as I know, that prevents anybody from testifying against other people.

Mr. ZILSEL. I understand that.

Mr. KUNZIG. So, you don't wish to testify because of possible danger of incriminating not other people, but yourself; is that correct?

Mr. ZILSEL. That is correct, sir.

At the same time I understand that I could waive this privilege if I wanted to—

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. ZILSEL. And I might do this, if it were not for the reason that I have outlined.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Zisel, since your legal admittance to the United States, have you ever traveled abroad?

Mr. ZILSEL. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have never left the borders of the United States since you first came here?

Mr. ZILSEL. No; I have not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are you acquainted with a man by the name of Byron Darling?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes; I am.

Mr. KUNZIG. Where did you know Mr. Darling?

Mr. ZILSEL. I first met Mr. Darling at the University of Wisconsin, where I was a graduate student, and he was a research associate. At the time I went to Yale a whole group of people in the physics department went to Yale, and he did also. So, I knew him at Yale also.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the same Professor Darling who is now or was at Ohio State until a few days ago?

Mr. ZILSEL. I believe so; yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Dr. Darling, or Professor Darling, as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ZILSEL. No, sir; not to my knowledge.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever attend Communist Party meetings?

Mr. ZILSEL. I will have to decline to answer that question on the grounds that I have stated.

Mr. KUNZIG. How did you obtain your employment, Mr. Zisel, at Yale University?

Mr. ZILSEL. I was there as a student, Mr. Kunzig. I'm afraid I don't quite understand the question. I was a student at Yale.

Mr. KUNZIG. I'm sorry. You were a student at Yale University. You never taught at Yale University in any way?

Mr. ZILSEL. No; I had a research assistantship as a graduate student there.

Mr. KUNZIG. What work did you do in this research assistantship?

Mr. ZILSEL. I did essentially work on my doctoral thesis in theoretical physics.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever work at any time for the United States Government?

Mr. ZILSEL. I believe that the research assistantship that I had was under an O and R contract. However, this was not a contract to me, but a contract to Yale University.

Mr. KUNZIG. And what type of work was it?

Mr. ZILSEL. Well, it was involved in calculations, in quantum mechanics and theoretical physics, which is my field of work.

Mr. KUNZIG. The benefit of which calculations was to be used by the United States Government?

Mr. ZILSEL. Well, in a sense. However, they were published. That is, there was no secret work of any kind involved in it. I believe the Office of Naval Research has a policy of encouraging fundamental research, with a view of general benefit which this confers.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever know a person by the name of Joseph Henry Cort—C-o-r-t?

Mr. ZILSEL. I will have to decline that question.

Mr. KUNZIG. On the same grounds?

Mr. ZILSEL. On the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a person by the name of Benjamin Dontzin—D-o-n-t-z-i-n—when you were at Yale as a student?

Mr. ZILSEL. I think I will have to decline to answer that question also.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, this committee has information, Professor Zisel, that these names that I am asking about and these people that we are asking for information about were members of a Communist cell at Yale University.

Do you know a Daniel Fine—Dr. Fine—who testified before this committee a few days ago?

Mr. ZILSEL. I don't believe I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a William Kerner—K-e-r-n-e-r?

Mr. ZILSEL. I will have to decline to answer that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, let's get that clear for the record again. You don't have to decline. Are you declining—

Mr. ZILSEL. I am declining on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, did you know an Arthur L. Levy at the time you were at Yale?

Mr. ZILSEL. I will have to decline to answer. I do decline that also.

Mr. KUNZIG. All right.

Now, do you know a Theodore S. Polumbaum, who testified before this committee yesterday?

That is P-o-l-u-m-b-a-u-m.

Mr. COBB. Could you spell that again, please?

Mr. KUNZIG. P-o-l-u-m-b-a-u-m.

Mr. ZILSEL. I believe I will decline to answer that also.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know while you were at Yale an individual by the name of Bernard W. Rubinstein—R-u-b-i-n-s-t-e-i-n?

Mr. ZILSEL. I don't recall.

Mr. KUNZIG. You don't recall?

Mr. ZILSEL. That's right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know a Gerald Brown?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Or Jerry Brown?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes; I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. You do?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him when you were at Yale?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him at the University of Wisconsin?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes; he was one of that same group of physics graduate students who went from Wisconsin to Yale.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ZILSEL. I will have to decline to answer that question.

Mr. VELDE. Let the record show that any declination to answer the question—I presume this is all right with counsel and witness—is based upon the first statement made after his refusal to answer the first question.

Mr. COBB. That's correct.

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes, sir.

I decline to answer these questions without at the same time admitting any implications of anything.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend any meeting of the Youth Commission of the Communist Party at which Gerald Brown was a speaker?

Mr. ZILSEL. In view of the fact that I have declined to answer questions on whether I was a member of the Communist Party, I feel this question has implications and should not be answered.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you decline to answer it—

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG (continuing). On the same grounds?

Mr. ZILSEL. On the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. During your time at Yale were you acquainted with an individual by the name of Harold T. Woerner—W-o-e-r-n-e-r?

Mr. ZILSEL. I don't recall.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, you said you are not a member of the Communist Party now. You also said that you wouldn't answer with regard to whether you have ever been a member of the Communist Party.

Now, were you a member of the Communist Party in 1952?

Mr. ZILSEL. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. In 1951?

Mr. ZILSEL. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. In 1950?

Mr. ZILSEL. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. In 1949?

Mr. ZILSEL. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. In 1948?

Mr. ZILSEL. I will decline on the grounds I have mentioned.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now we have pinpointed that just a bit.

What took place in 1948 to change your attitude probably on these problems or to change any membership you may have had?

Mr. ZILSEL. This question, sir, has implications which I have not admitted.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you refuse to answer?

Mr. ZILSEL. I believe clearly this question is based on implications from my refusal to answer previous questions. It's a leading question. I don't think I should answer that.

Mr. VELDE. It is what?

Mr. ZILSEL. It's a leading question.

Mr. KUNZIG. Oh, it's leading; yes.

Mr. VELDE. Let me get this straight, Mr. Zisel: This is a committee of Congress and not a court of law, and we have the duty of investigating communism, any subversive activities and propaganda throughout the country, and I believe that we have the right to ask leading questions, and counsel has the right to ask leading questions.

We are trying to lead you into giving us some information, which apparently you have, that would assist the committee in doing its duty, imposed by Congress. So the fact it is a leading question is no reason why you shouldn't be required to answer it.

(At this point Mr. Zisel conferred with Mr. Cobb.)

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes, sir; I understand that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, Professor Zisel, were you a member of the Communist Party in 1945?

Mr. ZILSEL. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were not?

Mr. ZILSEL. That's correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of the Communist Political Association at that time?

Mr. ZILSEL. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member in 1946?

Mr. ZILSEL. I would decline to answer that question on the same grounds, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. How about 1944?

Mr. ZILSEL. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Forty-three?

Mr. ZILSEL. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Forty-two?

Mr. ZILSEL. No, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. Forty-one?

Mr. ZILSEL. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Forty?

Mr. ZILSEL. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Thirty-nine?

Mr. ZILSEL. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Prior to the time you came to this country?

Mr. ZILSEL. I was 16 at the time I came to this country.

Mr. KUNZIG. Prior to that time were you a member of any youth group of any kind in Germany?

Mr. ZILSEL. Any youth group?

Mr. KUNZIG. Any Communist youth group?

Mr. ZILSEL. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you a member of any Nazi youth group?

Mr. ZILSEL. I am Jewish.

Mr. KUNZIG. I understand.

You came to this country and between the years of 1946 and 1948 is the period of time you do not desire to answer the question as to whether you were a member of the Communist Party; is that correct?

Mr. ZILSEL. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. While you were at the University of Wisconsin, were you active in the group known as the American Youth for Democracy?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes; I was.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know that to be a successor to the Young Communist League?

Mr. ZILSEL. I still don't know it to be a successor to the Young Communist League.

I was a member of a local organization at the University of Wisconsin at the time when the AYD was formed.

Mr. KUNZIG. What year was this in your life?

Mr. ZILSEL. I'm not sure that I recall this, but it was a matter—it is a matter of record. I joined the Wisconsin Liberals Association very shortly after I came to the University of Wisconsin.

Mr. KUNZIG. And what time was that?

Mr. ZILSEL. That was in the fall of 1943.

Mr. KUNZIG. Fall of 1943?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. At that time was there an organization known as the Young Communist League at the University of Wisconsin, to your knowledge?

Mr. ZILSEL. I believe that there was, since I saw notices and things of that sort, but I have no personal knowledge of it.

Mr. KUNZIG. Who were the officers of AYD at the period you were affiliated with it?

Mr. ZILSEL. At one time, one semester, I was president.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were president?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. How about others?

You don't mind naming names, because, of course, this has nothing to do with the Communist Party, from your own testimony.

Mr. ZILSEL. I would like to confer with counsel on this question.

Mr. VELDE. I didn't—

Mr. KUNZIG. He wants to confer with his counsel.

Mr. VELDE. Oh, all right. Certainly.

(At this point Mr. Zisel conferred with Mr. Cobb.)

Mr. ZILSEL. On the advice of counsel, I decline to answer this question.

Mr. KUNZIG. On the grounds that the AYD or names of people connected with the AYD might incriminate you?

(At this point Mr. Zisel conferred with Mr. Cobb.)

Mr. ZILSEL. On the grounds that my answer might incriminate me.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, do you know the provost of your university, Albert E. Wahl?

Is that the way you pronounce it?

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. KUNZIG. Now, did you go to Dr. Wahl or did you appear before Dr. Wahl and tell him that you had been previously a member of the Communist Party prior to coming to the university?

Mr. ZILSEL. I decline to answer that on the same grounds.

Mr. KUNZIG. I have here in my hands a newspaper, the Hartford Courant, April 20, 1953, which says—the head says—"Teacher Ad-

mits Being Former Red," and then it goes through the story, dated April 19, and headed Storrs—S-t-o-r-r-s. The article says:

The teacher—

and it doesn't name the teacher—

voluntarily appeared before university provost, Albert E. Wahl, to tell him of his former party connection. The teacher said he had been asked to appear before the Velde committee in Washington. After returning from Washington the teacher said he had not been called to testify but he expected to be called again.

Are you the person mentioned in this article?

Mr. ZILSEL. I decline to answer that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, now, are we to assume in any way, Professor, that you were willing to admit your membership in the Communist Party to your university officials but not under oath here before a committee of your Congress?

Mr. ZILSEL. I decline.

Mr. VELDE. Well, did you appear before the university officials of your university and tell them of your Communist Party connections at any time?

Mr. ZILSEL. I believe, Mr. Velde, that is the same question Mr. Kunzig just asked me.

Mr. VELDE. No; he asked you the question in a little different form. I am just asking you to tell me now if you did appear before the president of your university, or any committee composed of the faculty of the university, and discuss the matter of your being a member of the Communist Party or former member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ZILSEL. I decline to answer that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is there a difference apparently because you are under oath here today as against any appearance before professors or executive heads of the university?

Mr. ZILSEL. I decline to answer that.

Mr. VELDE. Do you have some questions, Mr. Doyle?

Mr. DOYLE. I think I have 1 or 2.

Professor, I will use your own language in prefacing my first question. My first question does have implications to it, and the implication is that I would infer from your testimony there was a time when you were a member of the Communist Party.

Now, on that implication, I will assume that there was some reason why you withdrew, because you have stated you are not now a member and the testimony shows the years when you were willing to state you were not a member; but you are a man in a high position, in educational circles, in our country—that you voluntarily chose to be your country—and I always compliment a man from another nation when he does become a citizen of my country, where I had the privilege of being born; but my question, Professor, is this: Knowing the purpose of this committee, which is to investigate subversive activities in this country, then report back to Congress in the field of legislation whatever recommendations we may make, can you help us in this area understand more clearly what it is that causes American citizens to join the Communist Party?

Now, I am trying to ask it in a way not to put you on a spot, or not to deliberately put you on a spot. I am not even trying to do it indirectly, Professor, believe me. I am trying to see if there is an area, even admitting the implication that at one time you were a Communist, if that is an implication.

Can you help this committee to understand—have you anything to offer to us, as your Congressmen, which will help us understand—what it is about the philosophy of the Communist Party, in whatever way you learned about it, that causes people to join it, and then to leave it?

If that is a double-barrel question—now, I am not trying to ask you a question that will even indirectly try to get you to answer in any way that would cause you to waive your constitutional privilege—and I always respect that right—but is there anything you can offer to us which would help us to understand that area so that in the field of legislation, which we are obligated to report on to Congress, we can better understand from you, as a trained mind, what there is about it?

Have you any suggestion in the field of legislation, for instance, for us?

Mr. ZILSEL. May I consult with my attorney before—

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. ZILSEL (continuing). I answer?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes.

(At this point Mr. Zilsel conferred with Mr. Cobb.)

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Now, before you answer, after having a conference with your counsel, which we are glad occurs, may I say this to you—I should have said it before: Unless you invite me so to do, I will not ask you any further questions, other than this one. In other words, I want you to know that I am not going to—

Mr. ZILSEL. All right; thank you, sir.

Mr. DOYLE (continuing). Ask any further question of you, unless you say I am at liberty so to do.

Mr. ZILSEL. I would like to first say that I do not admit any of the implications that started your question, sir, but I would like to, if I may, help the committee as far as I can on this one question that you asked me.

I don't think that I have anything to offer in the way of legislative suggestions. It would be the other part of your question that I would address myself to.

Now, here again I cannot, of course, see into the minds of other people, and I can only say how it might be conceivable that someone with a background something like my own might join the Communist Party and might afterward leave it.

I'm afraid I don't know how helpful this is going to be because my background is not at all typical.

As you know, as the record shows. I was born in Austria at a time when Austria was, what I believe can rightly be called, a democracy. I was a small boy in Austria when this democracy, in the perfectly legal way, turned into fascism—in a perfectly legal way, I mean, because it was the legally elected government that, by decree, abolished parliament and thereafter government, by decree, outlawed political parties which were opposed to the government, and became a full-fledged Fascist state.

Now, this was in 1934. It was at that time a native, home-born Austrian fascism which caused my father's disposition.

Then, in 1938 Austria was invaded by the Nazis and the home-grown breed of fascism was replaced by the German-Nazi kind, which

also I knew had come into power in Germany in the perfectly legal way. Germany also, at the time before that, had been a democracy.

In 1938 we had to leave the country, partly because we were Jewish and partly because of my father's political opinions, which were not acceptable to the Nazis; and we then came to this country in the full belief that this was the country with liberty and that things would be very different here.

After having been here for some time—I believe that this is perhaps an experience common to immigrants who come here with very high hopes and very high ideals—one begins to feel that perhaps everything is not quite as perfect in—not in the system of government in the United States, but in its operation, as we had thought.

When I came to this country, I felt that I was coming to the country of Jefferson and Lincoln. After having been here for some time, I began to have my doubts as to what extent the precepts of Jefferson and Lincoln were the ones that were actually being applied in practice in this country, and one can then come to the feeling that it can happen here also—that what happened over there in Germany could also happen here.

I remember reading a book by Sinclair Lewis, oh, somewhere around that time, entitled "It Can Happen Here."

Well, I think that at that same time in the late 1930's it appeared to many people that it was the Communists who were putting up the strongest and perhaps the only successful fight against the growing fascism in Europe.

Of course, in between then came the period of Nazi-Soviet pact, and that, of course, changed the outlook considerably.

At the same time, after the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union, it also began to be at least conceivable that perhaps the Nazi-Soviet pact had been a move on the part of the Soviets to gain time.

Well, I think I have perhaps outlined why people might feel that communism was the only alternative to fascism at that time.

I can only say now that I do not feel this way now, whether or not I ever did—and I'm not saying whether I ever did.

Ah the same time I still feel very strongly that it can happen here. In fact, I feel that we have already gone a long way toward it happening here—I mean fascism. I don't think we are there now, but I am very much afraid and I'm at this time a very puzzled man, because I don't know what the way to fight this is now.

I believe that the principles of Jefferson and Lincoln are the ones, but I do not know how to put them into practice and how to insure that they will be adopted.

I'll be very glad to answer any other questions which you may have—

MR. DOYLE. No; I—

MR. ZISEL. On the clarification of this statement.

MR. DOYLE. No; I think I will stand on my statement.

I thank you for taking the time to answer that question.

MR. VELDE. We do have other witnesses, and we are running behind schedule now, Mr. Zisel, but there is one thing I would like to bring to your attention—perhaps you didn't know about this—that the Committee on Un-American Activities was first organized by a House res-

olution in 1938, and the first investigations which were made had to deal with Nazi and espionage activities in the United States. At that time I presume that you or your father would have been willing to come before that committee and tell of some of the persecutions that the Nazis caused you and your family.

Mr. ZILSEL. Yes, sir.

Mr. VELDE. Well, now, there is abundant evidence before this committee and other administrative agencies of Government and other investigating committees that the Soviet Government is now a totalitarian form of government and in some ways similar to nazism, and it is very evident to me—and I think probably Mr. Doyle and other people—from hearing your testimony that you do have some information concerning Communist activities between the years 1946 and 1948.

I really feel you should be just as willing, in view of the fact that we know the Soviet system and American Communist Party is a part of the dictatorial, totalitarian system, and you should have the same interest in giving us information relative to that dictatorship as you would have had in 1938 giving this committee the information concerning Nazi totalitarianism.

I speak in all sincerity about that, and I believe that you owe your country that duty.

You know that we are legally set up. I am sure an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives feel that we should continue in existence and get these facts relative to Communist subversion or any other type of subversion that exists.

I am wondering if you would care to think this over a while longer and possibly if you would make up your mind later on to give us any information that you might have, the committee would certainly be happy to receive it, Mr. Zisel.

Mr. ZILSEL. I cannot, of course, know how I am going to feel at some time in the future; but I think at this time I have to stand on my previous statement and, in fact, I believe that what the liberty of my country demands of me is to take the stand I have taken.

Mr. VELDE. Yes. Well, that is all right.

There is just one thing I want to correct. You might have left the impression with some members or some of the public that the AYD was not a Communist organization. Time and time again we have received evidence that the American Youth for Democracy was a successor to the Young Communist League and was approximately the same membership as the Young Communist League, with some exceptions, of course, and you have stated, I believe, that the AYD was not a Communist organization. I just want to call your attention to the fact that the Attorney General, this committee and other bodies who are responsible to the American people have designated that organization as a Communist organization.

Is there any reason why this witness should be continued longer, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. No, sir.

Mr. VELDE. If not, the witness is excused, and the committee will stand in recess until 2:30.

(Thereupon, at 12:42 p. m., the hearing was recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 p. m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(At the hour of 3 p. m., of the same day, the proceedings were resumed, the following committee member being present: Hon. Kit Clardy.)

Mr. CLARDY. Are you ready, Mr. Counsel?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. Call your first witness.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Amdur, would you be sworn, sir?

Mr. CLARDY. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you will give before this committee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. AMDUR. I do, sir.

**TESTIMONY OF ISADORE AMDUR, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL,
STUART C. RAND**

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you wish counsel?

Mr. AMDUR. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. Since you are represented by counsel, would counsel please state his name and address for the record?

Mr. RAND. Stuart C. Rand. I am a member of the law firm of Choate, Paul & Stewart, 30 State Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. KUNZIG. Mr. Chairman, you will remember Mr. Rand was before this committee this morning and so is familiar with the rules of the committee.

Mr. CLARDY. Thank you.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state your full name and address, please, sir?

Mr. AMDUR. Isadore Amdur, 24 Sacramento Street, Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. KUNZIG. What is your present employment, Professor Amdur?

Mr. AMDUR. I am a professor of physical chemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you state for the committee your educational background in chronological order?

Mr. AMDUR. I was educated in the public schools of Pittsburgh. I went to the University of Pittsburgh, where I received my bachelor's degree in February 1930, my master's degree in August of that year, and a Ph. D. degree in June of 1932.

Mr. KUNZIG. Does that complete the formal education?

Mr. AMDUR. Yes, that completes the formal education.

Mr. KUNZIG. I think at this point, Mr. Chairman, we might let the record show that the committee consists of a subcommittee of one.

Mr. CLARDY. The record will so show that we are sitting as a subcommittee here this afternoon.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you now state for the committee your occupational employment background?

Mr. AMDUR. Yes, sir. Following the receipt of my Ph. D. degree I was a postdoctor and fellow at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I was appointed instructor in 1934. I was promoted to assistant professor in 1940, to associate professor in 1945, and to full professor in 1951.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is what you are today?

Mr. AMDUR. That is what I am to date.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor, have you at any time been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. I have.

Mr. KUNZIG. Would you give the dates and times that you were a member?

Mr. AMDUR. To the best of my recollection, I believe that I joined the party in 1938 and I believe that I left the party around 1944.

Mr. KUNZIG. Professor Amdur, to the best of your ability would you describe to the subcommittee what caused you to join the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. It is a bit difficult to reconstruct at this distance all of the reasons. I can think of some of them. One very strong reason was a feeling of inner rage that the situation in Europe in which nazism was rampant—I am of Jewish extraction—I felt that personally somewhat deeply. I had the impression that at that time the western democracies, if you will, were not doing much to stem that. I could find no evidence of it. It seemed as though Russia was trying to do something about it. That was my primary motivation.

There was perhaps a secondary reason of this type. My education came very rapidly and intensely. I had devoted a great deal of my time to studies and practically nothing to outside activities. I was relatively immature in anything except my scientific work. I think at this time I began to become aware of the world outside chemistry and I believe there was some sort of feeling to find out what things were about. The primary motive, I think, was nazism.

Mr. CLARDY. About how old were you at that time?

Mr. AMDUR. When I joined I would have been 28.

Mr. KUNZIG. You say you became aware of the world outside and you joined the party in 1938. You were certainly aware in August of 1939 of the Hitler-Stalin pact and although you were present this morning and heard some of the questions, will you tell us how you were able to stay a Communist in line with what you have just testified to?

Mr. AMDUR. I think there were possibly two reasons. One was that I have a tendency as a scientist to proceed very slowly when any question comes up and when any point is in doubt it has been my training all my life to study it carefully and not in haste and to try to arrive at a conclusion. At that time it had been stated by members of the party and others that the purpose of this pact was to gain time for Russia, that by having time in which she could be guaranteed of no hostilities she would be better able to prepare for what seemed to be imminent, mainly a clash between Germany and Russia, and I think I felt that I might well wait out a reasonable time to see if that was true. I think that must have been my point of view at the time, as nearly as I can remember.

Mr. CLARDY. In other words, the party's line was that Mr. Stalin was swindling Mr. Hitler in this agreement?

Mr. AMDUR. I think that was just about it.

Mr. CLARDY. You accepted that?

Mr. AMDUR. Yes, at the time.

Mr. KUNZIG. What cell or group of the Communist Party did you first become a member of?

Mr. AMDUR. At MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is that the same group about which testimony was given this morning?

Mr. AMDUR. That was one of the groups mentioned this morning, yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. What other people, to the best of your knowledge, were members of that group when you were a member and whom you know to have been Communists?

Mr. AMDUR. There was Mr. Martin who testified this morning; Mr. Levinson.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you know his first name?

Mr. AMDUR. Norman Levinson.

Mr. KUNZIG. Anybody else?

Mr. AMDUR. Mr. Arguinbau.

Mr. CLARDY. And his first name?

Mr. AMDUR. Lawrence Arguinbau. Then there was Mr. Struik and Mr. Gelbardt. I cannot spell that last name. I think it is probably G-e-l-b-a-r-d-t.¹

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew all these men to be Communists?

Mr. AMDUR. I knew all these men in that I met with them at one time or another.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you know Mr. Gelbardt's first name?

Mr. AMDUR. I do not recall it.

Mr. CLARDY. And the other person you named?

Mr. AMDUR. Dirk Struik. Then there was Edwin Blaisdell and Nathan Rosen. I think Rosen's first name was Nathan. At the moment those are all that I can think of.

Mr. KUNZIG. They were members of the group at MIT?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. What position did Rosen hold at MIT?

Mr. AMDUR. I don't know his exact title. He was in the department of physics.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is he there any more?

Mr. AMDUR. No, he is not.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know his present whereabouts?

Mr. AMDUR. I have heard he is in the State of Israel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know the present whereabouts of Edwin Blaisdell?

Mr. AMDUR. I believe he is with the du Pont Co., and which one of the branches I do not know.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you, after being a member of the MIT group, become a member of any larger group in the Boston area?

Mr. AMDUR. The MIT group met some period during the time when I was a member with a group from Harvard. There may have been a sprinkling of a few other people from other localities, but predominantly it was a Harvard and MIT group.

Mr. KUNZIG. Can you give us the names of members of this group whom you knew to be Communists over and above those whom you have already mentioned from MIT?

Mr. AMDUR. There was Wendel Furry.

Mr. CLARDY. We are talking about the Harvard group?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed.

Mr. AMDUR. Carl Grossenbacher.

¹ Correct name of this individual is Abe Gelbart.

Mr. CLARDY. Is that Carl spelled with a "K" or with a "C"?

Mr. AMDUR. I don't know, sir. Then there was Marcus Singer.

Mr. KUNZIG. Is he an optometrist?

Mr. AMDUR. No; I think his profession was zoology or something like that, something related to that.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know his present whereabouts?

Mr. AMDUR. No, I do not. I do not know whether he is still in Cambridge or Boston.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were there any others?

Mr. AMDUR. I cannot think of others from Harvard at this point.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know the present whereabouts of Carl Grossenbacher?

Mr. AMDUR. No.

Mr. CLARDY. What was the name of that Harvard group, or did it have a name?

Mr. AMDUR. I am not sure it had a name outside of the Harvard group, no more than the MIT group had a name outside of the MIT group.

Mr. CLARDY. What did you at MIT identify yourselves as?

Mr. AMDUR. MIT group, when we spoke about it.

Mr. CLARDY. You all knew each other as fellow Communists and you didn't need any further identification?

Mr. AMDUR. That is right.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know Howard Allen Bridgman?

Mr. AMDUR. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Or Richard Edsall?

Mr. AMDUR. I don't know if he was in Harvard. I knew of Richard Edsall.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you know him as a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. I don't believe I ever attended a meeting with him in that sense.

Mr. KUNZIG. Well, in any other sense or in your opinion was he a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. In my opinion he would have been.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know anything about his present whereabouts? I believe he is the man who fled to Canada after Philbrick's testimony.

Mr. AMDUR. I have heard that.

Mr. KUNZIG. You have mentioned the MIT group and the larger Harvard group with which you were associated. Was there any other group or cell of the Communist Party with which you were associated?

Mr. AMDUR. So far as I can tell those were the two groups.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you attend any meetings or have anything to do with a professional group or a group of professors or the lawyers, teachers, doctors, and so forth, in the Boston area?

Mr. AMDUR. I do not believe so.

Mr. KUNZIG. Are there any other members of the party whom you knew to be members of the party other than those that you have already mentioned, not necessarily in just the MIT or Harvard group, but in any group?

Mr. AMDUR. I think my acquaintance was predominantly among that group and my recollection would be of just those people, I believe.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever do any work for the Government of the United States?

Mr. AMDUR. Yes, at MIT. My salary was paid by MIT but the contracts I believe were under some sort of Government sponsorship.

Mr. KUNZIG. What type of work was that and what part of the Government sponsored it?

Mr. AMDUR. It was during the war and I believe there were three distinct projects on which I worked. I believe one was for the Office of Scientific Research and Development, known as OSRD.

Mr. KUNZIG. What year was that when you worked for it?

Mr. AMDUR. From early 1943 into about the middle of 1944.

Mr. KUNZIG. In other words, according to your testimony that was while you were still a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. What was your next Government employment?

Mr. AMDUR. I worked during the same period part time on a project under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Navy Ordnance. I think I have that wrong. It was the Department of the Navy, the Ordnance Bureau.

Mr. KUNZIG. And that was also while you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct, and then, about 1944 to late 1945 I was working on the project for the Army Engineer Corps which I think was known as the Manhattan project in that part of the project located in MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever cleared by the Navy on the Manhattan project or any other group when you worked for the Government in order to handle classified materials?

Mr. AMDUR. I don't know exactly what the specifications of the clearance was. I was cleared to work on this project.

Mr. KUNZIG. You were cleared to work on the Manhattan project?

Mr. AMDUR. That is right, or so I was told.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever questioned by Government officials with regard to your Communist activity, whether you were a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. I was never questioned. We filled out regular forms which I submitted.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did those forms contain any questions or ask you for any information as to membership in the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. Those forms did not ask about membership in the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. And that was for the Manhattan project?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. No question that tied in with possible party membership?

Mr. AMDUR. I cannot be too sure about the specific question. It was on one of the forms that I filled out, there was a question whether the person who filled out the form belonged to an organization advocating the violent overthrow of the Government.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. AMDUR. That question was there, but to the best of my recollection there was no question saying, "Are you a member of the Communist Party?"

Mr. CLARDY. The question you described as being there is the one we are, of course, familiar with.

Mr. AMDUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you answer that question?

Mr. AMDUR. I did answer that question.

Mr. CLARDY. You may take up, Counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. How did you answer that question?

Mr. AMDUR. I answered that question in the negative.

Mr. KUNZIG. You felt at that time that the Communist Party was not seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force?

Mr. AMDUR. I sincerely felt that and the group with which I had been associating had never indicated in any way that that was other than the situation.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you feel that way today?

Mr. AMDUR. I do not feel that way today.

Mr. CLARDY. You probably then at that time did not study the program of the Communist Party very carefully, did you?

Mr. AMDUR. Mr. Clardy, my activities in the Communist Party involved a minimum of study on my part. I was first and last, well, I don't know about the middle, a scientist devoted to and devoting as much time as I could to my scientific activities. Not only was I working for the war effort but doing some teaching and helping students on their graduate work. My attendance was sporadic and I was perfectly willing to believe what people in our group were saying, namely, that if any change in the Government of the United States were to come about it would be by constitutional means.

Mr. CLARDY. Would it be fair to say then that your interest in the Semitic angle or the anti-Semitic angle might have somewhat blinded you so that you did not probe as a scientist would very far beneath the surface?

Mr. AMDUR. I think that was part of the reason and the other part was that I had a busy life and there was not time to probe into it and obviously I did not have the inclination because I put the other things, including family, first.

Mr. CLARDY. You fell for the line then, to use the vernacular?

Mr. AMDUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. KUNZIG. Were you ever a member of the World Federation of Scientific Workers?

Mr. AMDUR. I don't know if I was a member of the World Federation because I don't know what constitutes that.

Mr. KUNZIG. What were you a member of?

Mr. AMDUR. Of the American Federation of Scientific Workers, which I believe had some affiliation with the group you mentioned.

Mr. KUNZIG. Just what was your function in that group?

Mr. AMDUR. Outside of being a member?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, as a member.

Mr. AMDUR. I am not sure that I understand the question, sir. What were my activities?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes.

Mr. AMDUR. One of the things in which I was interested while in the group was in helping UNESCO get started and developed. I was in addition interested in the general aims of the organization which was to study the social implications of science, namely the implication of the impact of science on the nonscientific public at large, the pro-

fessional status of scientists, whether their general compensation was adequate. I believe, however, that my major interest was in UNESCO.

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe you were also connected with the American Academy of Arts and Sciences?

Mr. AMBUR. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I do not mean to imply anything against the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Did you have any particular function in that organization or in any committee?

Mr. AMBUR. Yes, I was both a member and chairman of the international relations committee. I believe for some time it was known as the UNESCO committee. I was also secretary of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences for several years.

Mr. CLARDY. You said the UNESCO committee?

Mr. AMBUR. Yes, of the committee on UNESCO.

Mr. CLARDY. What was the group seeking to do?

Mr. AMBUR. During that period there was something of a battle in the opinion of certain scientists to get a proper recognition of the importance of science in the UNESCO organization. As originally contemplated it was to be an organization known as UNACO which had no science in it whatever, and one of the things that I was interested in was seeing that if this organization was to deal with international culture activities that science be not left out.

Mr. CLARDY. Then it was part of the Communist Party program to see that that was done?

Mr. AMBUR. I don't know that that is a proper statement, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Well, how would you phrase it?

Mr. AMBUR. I believe that it was part of anybody's program who believed in UNESCO. My activities in UNESCO were completely independent of any association with the Communist Party. I believe today that UNESCO is a very fine organization.

Mr. CLARDY. We differ there, and radically.

Mr. AMBUR. I am sorry. I do believe that UNESCO is an organization doing a useful job.

Mr. CLARDY. I will have to take you to the woodshed after this is over.

Mr. AMBUR. I hope you won't be too hard. That was why I worked so hard. It was not with my association with the Communist Party.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you ever know somebody by the name of Arnold as being a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AMBUR. I did know a Mr. Arnold who was at MIT.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was he a graduate student?

Mr. AMBUR. Yes, during that period.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know his full name?

Mr. AMBUR. I believe his first name was Kenneth Arnold.

Mr. KUNZIG. You knew him to be a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. AMBUR. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Do you know his whereabouts at the present time?

Mr. AMBUR. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. The question that we had discussed earlier this morning with Professor Martin is the question I am about to propound to you now, to see that your entire relationship with the Communist Party was a secret relationship.

Mr. AMDUR. Those of us who were members did not publicize the fact. I think the word "secret" as I heard it used some this morning has a more sinister connotation than it had at that time. Our chief interest in not revealing our association, I believe, was an understandable one, to try to keep our jobs. We were young at that time. I joined while I was still an instructor. We knew that it was unpopular to be a member of the Communist Party and I think most of us felt that if it became public knowledge, that our scientific careers which were far more important to us would be in jeopardy, and I believe that was the chief reason that we did not want it divulged.

Mr. CLARDY. Is it fair to say you concealed that membership from public gaze, at least?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. Wasn't it in reality the decision of the Communist Party to have its members use aliases rather than necessarily a personal decision?

Mr. AMDUR. I am not aware of whether that decision was ever formally handed to me as such.

Mr. KUNZIG. Did you have an alias?

Mr. AMDUR. I did. May I qualify that, sir?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, go right ahead.

Mr. AMDUR. When I joined the party I filled out some sort of card on which a name was signed which was not mine. I was not known by any other name than my name with the people with whom I associated in the party.

Mr. CLARDY. Who selected the alias on the card?

Mr. AMDUR. I am sure I must have.

Mr. CLARDY. With any prompting or help?

Mr. AMDUR. There I haven't any idea of it at all.

Mr. CLARDY. You don't remember that?

Mr. AMDUR. No.

Mr. KUNZIG. Was this all like some schoolboy's game to you, and I don't mean that in an impertinent fashion, when you joined?

Mr. AMDUR. I don't think it was in that light or vein. I think it was more in the vein of intellectual activity trying to find out what some of the answers were that were troubling young men in what I believed were troubled times at that period. It was not a childish thing. We were serious about it, but none of us, I am sure, were conspiratorial about it.

Mr. KUNZIG. I believe you have an interesting theory as to why mathematicians and scientists got into this. I hope you will express it to the subcommittee.

Mr. AMDUR. I hope this will be construed as my personal theory.

Mr. CLARDY. It will be, just as my remark about UNESCO must be considered as my own. I don't know what the other members of the committee think about that. To me it is something worse than useless, but I may be overruled.

Mr. AMDUR. My theory about the scientists that are in UNESCO is the following, I believe—

Mr. KUNZIG. You mean, the Communist Party? You are not confusing those two when you said UNESCO?

Mr. AMDUR. I hope that is correct in the record.

Mr. CLARDY. I am glad that you are taking this good-naturedly. This is so different from the other hearings. Go ahead.

Mr. AMDUR. I believe that a relatively large number of scientists joined the Communist Party partly because their training and activity makes it natural for them to do so. A scientist, by nature, is a radical person. He is inclined to question everything, to revolt against that which has gone before if in his opinion it does not jibe with what he thinks the present facts are, and I believe quite sincerely but personally that scientists are more prone to go into an unpopular organization such as the Communist Party in an attempt to find out what it is all about, and it is my belief that the most radical of the natural scientists or of scientists are probably the mathematicians. I might allow room for philosophers. I don't know, but the mathematicians I believe would come first in that category. I believe the physicists are a close second and the chemists and biologists and so forth would bring up the rear.

Mr. CLARDY. Most of my mathematical friends claim that the legal profession is very inexact, but I thought they would be more conservative.

Mr. AMDUR. I believe those two views are not inconsistent. I merely want to say this beyond the fact that scientists are continually questioning and by tradition are not afraid to say that something is not so. In fact, if they do not do so they are not honest scientists.

Mr. CLARDY. You are saying something that contradicts something you said earlier. You said you fell for this phony line and didn't make this inquiry that a scientist would.

Mr. AMDUR. I believe at the time I joined I was not as good a scientist as I am now.

Mr. CLARDY. You think you have improved?

Mr. AMDUR. I hope so.

Mr. KUNZIG. This questioning and continual questioning which you referred to the way scientists would do, how long must this go on? With you it was 6 years. This morning with another witness it was 8 years. Now in an undercover organization does it take that long to find out what the Communist Party stands for?

Mr. AMDUR. No, I don't think it should take that long and I think if I had given it my full time and full attention and full activity I would doubt I would need more than a year to find out.

Mr. CLARDY. What shocked you into sensibility?

Mr. AMDUR. It was not a shock. I left the party, as I may have indicated, because in the first place I was quite fed up with dogmatism of the party. I knew that all of the black and white which the party taught was not all black and white.

Mr. CLARDY. You rebelled against having the line told to you?

Mr. AMDUR. Having the line dictated to me, and in addition the United States was doing things to fight nazism and fascism much better than even the Communists said they would at the time that I had joined. I had a family that was beginning to grow up and my scientific work, and the combination of all those. It was not a sharp rebellion.

Mr. CLARDY. It just faded out.

Mr. AMDUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. We have heard other witnesses who put it the same way.

Mr. AMDUR. That was so in my case; yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to ask you a most important question. What is your opinion at the present time as an ex-Communist and as a person who knows the Communist way of life and thought whether professors who are today Communists should teach in the universities and schools of America?

Mr. AMDUR. I believe that at present, active Communists should not be permitted to so teach.

Mr. KUNZIG. If you were in charge of appointing professors and teachers, would you appoint a Communist to a teaching position?

Mr. AMDUR. I would not. Might I add some things to my statement just before that?

Mr. KUNZIG. Certainly.

Mr. AMDUR. I believe they should not teach and although it has not been brought into the question, I believe, however, that the termination of teaching appointments for such people should be left to the institutions rather than some outside agency.

Mr. CLARDY. I assure you this committee has never attempted to invade that problem.

Mr. AMDUR. I did not have this committee in mind when I said that.

Mr. CLARDY. No; but a great many other abusive witnesses here have not only insinuated, but have accused.

Mr. AMDUR. I was not thinking of this committee, but of government in the broad sense. I believe that that particular situation can be best taken care of most democratically and healthfully by having the institution do it.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you agree that the institutions are handicapped in their ability to develop the facts that this committee can develop?

Mr. AMDUR. That is right.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you not agree that this committee performs a useful function when it discloses those facts so that the institutions of higher learning may use them for the purpose we are talking about?

Mr. AMDUR. When a committee such as this discloses facts indicating current membership or recent membership?

Mr. CLARDY. Or still sympathy with.

Mr. AMDUR. I might qualify that because the word "sympathy" is quite a general one, but if I might limit my statement to actual membership, but to the extent that this committee reveals present membership in the Communist Party and indicates that to the institutions, I would think it serves a useful purpose.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you say that because membership in the Communist Party is utterly incompatible with academic freedom and with the things that a teacher must and should possess if he is to teach honestly.

Mr. AMDUR. I think the present membership would be incompatible.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. AMDUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to come back to the discussion we had a moment ago about the university having any way of knowing. So many times it is said—and one reads in the newspapers lately—that the college or the university itself can handle the situation alone, and I would like to go one step further than what we have done so far and ask you whether it isn't a fact that the college has almost no

way of knowing. For example, if you were not testifying today, could any college know of your activities, particularly when they were so secret?

Mr. AMBUR. They did not know, I believe, of my activities at the time I was a member. If I were a member now with the greater awareness of the public in general, I am not sure that they would be so ignorant of it, but I believe that you do have a valid point that in general the administrative officials of the institution do not pry into these things and in general they would not know. But there is a big difference in the awareness at the present time compared to some years ago.

Mr. KUNZIG. Don't you feel, though, Professor Amdur, that because of the increased public interest and because of the attitude of the public today toward Communists that a present-day Communist would be a hundred times more careful to conceal his identity if he were in a university than perhaps some years ago.

Mr. AMBUR. I believe it is a possibility, but there is a paradox there. If he conceals his activities too successfully, I believe he will not function in the way he thinks he ought to function.

Mr. KUNZIG. In which way do you mean that he ought to function?

Mr. AMBUR. Perhaps to arouse opinion in the institution for whatever cause he thinks is important at the time, which I believe now in general would be an unpopular cause.

Mr. CLARDY. Alger Hiss concealed his Communist connections for a great many years and he had accomplished a great deal; did he not?

Mr. AMBUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. I think that is what counsel had in mind.

Mr. AMBUR. I think in general that the administrative officials would not be well equipped to find out.

Mr. CLARDY. If this committee had not pursued Alger Hiss as it did, don't you think that he probably could still be continuing in the Government's service, at least up until the 20th of January of this year?

Mr. AMBUR. I think it is possible; yes, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. I was going to ask, at the time you were a Communist and a professor, just how would the university have gotten any evidence to prove that you were a Communist if, for example, they were trying to check on such things?

Mr. AMBUR. At that time I believe it would have been very difficult for them to have done so.

Mr. KUNZIG. It would have been virtually impossible for them.

Mr. AMBUR. Essentially so; yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you tell us a little more about the particular nature of the work that you were engaged in on the three projects that you named?

Mr. AMBUR. Yes, sir. I have to be cautious.

Mr. CLARDY. Don't reveal any secrets that will endanger the national security; but, with that limitation, tell us what you can.

Mr. AMBUR. Yes, sir. Two of the projects in which I was active concurrently—that is, from 1933 to mid-1944—were both engaged with the preparation of scientific optical material for use in optical instruments in the form of lenses, prisms, and such.

The other project, the Manhattan project, was not involved with the activities that one reads about in the newspapers, but the sort with

which I was connected was involved in producing materials which would then be sent to another part used in the preparation of fissionable material. I am trying not to say too much because I don't know what is declassified.

Mr. CLARDY. We could say that it was in the main a highly classified type of work.

Mr. AMDUR. The Manhattan project was highly classified, and I believe the other two carried relatively lower classifications, but they were all classified.

Mr. CLARDY. I do not think we have explored this, and I would like to get into it briefly. Were you brought into the party through solicitation from some other person, from someone else, or did you approach someone on your own behalf?

Mr. AMDUR. I did not approach but I was becoming interested, not in the party as such but in the things I spoke about which caused me to join the party. I was, I believe, formally brought into the party by an individual asking me if I was ready to join, and I said "Yes."

Mr. CLARDY. Was that one of this group that you have named?

Mr. AMDUR. It was.

Mr. CLARDY. And when he approached you he did so, I presume, after some exploratory conversations to discover how far you had drifted in that direction?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct.

Mr. CLARDY. He thought you and the time were ripe. He popped the question, so to speak?

Mr. AMDUR. Popped the question, and he had very little of a job on his hands.

Mr. CLARDY. Did you have to pay any dues or membership fees?

Mr. AMDUR. There were dues. I don't know what they were, except that there was some sort of scale and they were not very great. There was a scale based on salary.

Mr. CLARDY. That is what I am wondering about. Many of them have testified there was a sort of income-tax levy on members of a certain percentage, is that right?

Mr. AMDUR. Yes; something of the sort.

Mr. CLARDY. Do you remember what percent your tax was.

Mr. AMDUR. I do not. At the time I joined I was relatively low in the academic ladder, and I do not think my dues averaged more than about \$2 per month for the whole time I was in, and at the beginning it might have been less than that.

Mr. CLARDY. You were brought in, you say, because you were mentally ripe, but through the solicitation of someone else?

Mr. AMDUR. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. After you became a member, did you perform the same process on someone else to bring them into the ring?

Mr. AMDUR. I am happy to say that it is my sincere belief that I have never brought another individual into the Communist Party. My participation was a completely individual affair.

Mr. CLARDY. After you became a member, did you attend regular meetings of some sort?

Mr. AMDUR. Meetings were scheduled nominally about every 2 weeks. In a group of this sort the discipline expected for meeting attendance was not very great, and I believe the number of times I played hookey probably exceeded the number of times I attended.

For example, our family was in the habit of going to Maine in the summer, where we rented a place and they would go there; we would go for a good 3 months out of the year, and I was never in a hurry to let anyone know just when I was coming back, so that the number of attendances per year was not very great, and I think this might in part—and I don't mean it to explain it completely—this might explain why I was in for a relatively long period of time.

Mr. CLARDY. You were a sort of backslider.

Mr. AMDUR. I was not what the Communists would call a very good member.

Mr. CLARDY. Would you say that the others whom you have named were probably more responsive to the party demands?

Mr. AMDUR. Some were and some were not. I think you will find the complete spectrum among the group.

Mr. CLARDY. You have mentioned Wendell Furry. He has appeared before us. You may have read something of his appearance.

Mr. AMDUR. I am aware of it.

Mr. CLARDY. You are aware of the stand and the position he has taken before this committee?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct.

Mr. CLARDY. Is there any doubt that the Wendell Furry who appeared before this committee is the same Wendell Furry whom you have described in the Communist Party?

Mr. AMDUR. There is no doubt at all.

Mr. CLARDY. Have you attended closed meetings with him, meetings of the party?

Mr. AMDUR. I have attended meetings with him during the period in which I was in.

Mr. CLARDY. Did he take any particularly outstanding part in those meetings or was he just one of the boys?

Mr. AMDUR. I don't recall that his activity was any more predominant than any of the rest of us.

Mr. CLARDY. At those meetings did you discuss the objectives and the line that was to be taken by the party?

Mr. AMDUR. Those were discussed.

Mr. CLARDY. So you discussed, among yourselves, how best to promote the interests of the Communist Party within the circles within which you traveled?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct.

Mr. CLARDY. Without any bad implication at all, would it be fair to say that you and the other members of the group, including Mr. Furry, were doing what you could in your way to promote the interest of the party in this Nation?

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct, but I would like to qualify that by saying that those particular activities were not contrary to the interests of the Nation at that time.

Mr. CLARDY. That is, of course, your interpretation.

Mr. AMDUR. I want it on the record as such; yes.

Mr. CLARDY. Would it not be fair to say that as you viewed it you did not think so.

Mr. AMDUR. That is correct, as I viewed it I at no time felt that I was doing any disloyal thing to the country. Unpopular, yes; disloyal, no.

MR. CLARDY. I asked you a question earlier and I will ask you to repeat the answer because I want to expand the question a little bit. Did you at any time read Communist literature so that you thoroughly understood the Marxist theory of how the proletariat would eventually take over?

MR. AMDUR. I would like to answer that question in two parts. I did read Communist literature. I found it virtually impossible to understand a very large part of it. I don't know how to describe it, but much of it is completely incomprehensible. Perhaps it could be referred to as doubletalk. One could take from it whatever meaning he wishes.

MR. CLARDY. And sometimes no meaning at all.

MR. AMDUR. And sometimes no meaning at all, and I believe one of the greatest chores during my period in the party was the reading of this literature and the attempt to understand it.

MR. CLARDY. I presume you have read *Das Kapital* so that you know the economic theories or nonsense that Karl Marx advanced?

MR. AMDUR. I have read it.

MR. CLARDY. Of course, if you were in court and you were in contempt, that would probably be one of the worst sentences that I could impose upon you, the reading of that book. I have read it and I will confess it is very turgid. You did read it and found it most difficult?

MR. AMDUR. Yes.

MR. CLARDY. Didn't it occur to you that implicit in the Communist doctrine was this theory that socialism could only live when the overthrow of other forms of government was accomplished.

MR. AMDUR. Any time such a statement occurred and was discussed, and I would like to remind you if I may that at that particular period the Communist Party was not as unpopular in the public mind.

MR. CLARDY. It was with me.

MR. AMDUR. In the general public mind. Russia was our ally. When such questions were discussed those who were explaining them would point out that this could be interpreted in the sense of meaning that when the situation became such that one might expect a violent overthrow, then the normal legislative bodies of the country would change the form of government which I believe would be called socialism. That was the official explanation and I believe that people like myself wanted to believe it and it was not inconsistent with the way the party was acting during much of that period.

MR. CLARDY. Looking back on it, don't you think you were a little naive in accepting that explanation?

MR. AMDUR. I don't like that word myself and I don't like to call myself names, but I think I was both naive and stupid.

MR. CLARDY. I appreciate your agreeing with that because it has appeared to me after listening to quite a number of witnesses that the human mind is capable of almost anything. We can convince ourselves of almost anything if we want to believe it. You wanted to believe it, as I understand, because you thought that the Communists were doing something for the Jewish people and to fight anti-Semitism, as I understand it.

MR. AMDUR. That is correct.

MR. CLARDY. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Kunzig?

Mr. KUNZIG. Yes, sir. I wanted to ask this: You said that at about 1944 and thereafter you sort of shuffled off from the Communist Party?

Mr. AMBUR. Yes.

Mr. KUNZIG. When you worked on the Manhattan project, were you still, in your own mind, a Communist at that time or had you completely finished the project of shuffling off?

Mr. AMBUR. To the best of my belief I had finished, and my belief may be in error, but I sincerely wish to state that it is my honest belief that at that time I had finished with it.

Mr. KUNZIG. I would like to ask you this: Have you furnished the information that you have given today in your testimony to any other branch of Government prior to your subpoena to come before this committee?

Mr. AMBUR. No; I have not.

Mr. KUNZIG. This is the first time that this material, this information, has been made public?

Mr. AMBUR. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. If you were so asked in the future to furnish it to any other branch of the Government, I assume you would be willing to do so.

Mr. AMBUR. That is correct.

Mr. KUNZIG. That is all I have.

Mr. CLARBY. Is there anything else that you can summon up that you think might help this committee in its work?

Mr. AMBUR. I hope, sir, you won't think me impertinent if I say one thing.

Mr. CLARBY. Not at all.

Mr. AMBUR. I think this committee might serve a very useful purpose if it believes, as I hope it does, that there are relatively few active Communists present in institutions of higher learning. Say so forcibly.

Mr. CLARBY. We have said that quite a few times but we have added to that statement this fact, that just as one bad apple in a barrel can spoil the whole barrel, even a few Communists in our educational system can work havoc with our young minds. We agree with you that throughout the system they are not there in overwhelming numbers and I don't believe they are as great as in my own profession, the legal profession. I wish we could root them out and disbar them forever and maybe some day that can be done.

I want to thank you because I think you have done something worthwhile. I think, speaking for the committee, that we feel you have performed a worthwhile service to your Government and to this Congress and I trust, sir, that there will be no sanctions imposed upon you because, in my opinion, you do not deserve it. Or, if you find yourself in any trouble or difficulty as the result of your appearance here today, you will communicate with this committee so that we can be of assistance to you.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. KUNZIG. You are excused, sir.

(The witness was excused.)

Mr. KUNZIG. There is one more witness, sir.

Mr. CLARBY. Mr. Rand, I thank you for your splendid conduct. It stands out in startling contrast to some of our fellows in the profession.

Mr. RAND. Thank you, sir.

Mr. CLARBY. Call the next witness.

Mr. TAVENNER. I call Mr. Max Weitzman. Is he in the hearing room? Will you please come forward?

Mr. CLARDY. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WEITZMAN. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MAX WEITZMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, GABRIEL KANTROVITZ

Mr. TAVENNER. State your name, please.

Mr. WEITZMAN. Max Weitzman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you accompanied by counsel, Mr. Weitzman?

Mr. WEITZMAN. I have the pleasure of being accompanied by counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will counsel please identify himself for the record?

Mr. KANTROVITZ. Gabriel Kantrovitz, Boston, Mass.

At this time, Mr. Congressman and Mr. Tavenner, I wonder if I could submit for your consideration a motion to vacate the subpoena?

Mr. CLARDY. Have you appeared before this committee prior to today?

Mr. KANTROVITZ. I appeared 2 years ago before another committee.

Mr. CLARDY. Perhaps I had better tell you that we do not allow counsel to submit statements. You can submit a written statement or a written motion, and you may advise with your client at any time on the legal questions involved, but we have an inflexible rule that does not permit counsel to address the committee at any time. So, if you will submit your motion in writing, we will accept it.

Mr. KANTROVITZ. I wonder if I might state that this service was made upon Mr. Weitzman by a United States marshal at his school during school hours on a schoolday.

Mr. CLARDY. Whatever you say will be taken into consideration.

Mr. KANTROVITZ. That is in violation of the ninth and tenth amendments.

Mr. CLARDY. It will be passed on by the entire committee. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born?

Mr. WEITZMAN. In Poland in 1915, on March 16.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you first enter the United States?

Mr. WEITZMAN. In 1920, on July 20.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a naturalized American citizen?

Mr. WEITZMAN. My name appears on the naturalization papers of my father, and when he became a citizen I automatically became a citizen in my boyhood.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did that occur?

Mr. WEITZMAN. In the 1920's, I think in 1928.

Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Teacher, public-school teacher.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your formal education training consisted of?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Yes, certainly. I was educated in the public schools of New York City. I am a graduate of the College of the City of New York, where I got my bachelor's degree.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you obtain that degree?

Mr. WEITZMAN. In 1941, in June, and in Boston University I obtained my master's degree in June of 1949.

Mr. CLARDY. I will have to suspend the proceedings for a brief period of time. I have been called to the House. I will be back just as quickly as I can do that.

(Thereupon a short recess was taken.)

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, counsel.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Weitzman, will you tell the committee, please, what your record of employment has been since 1941?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Since 1941 I held odd jobs in the city of New York until 1942, when I enrolled with the Signal Corps branch of Government service as a civilian learning the principles of radio and electricity. That was meant to equip me for the position as an inspector of radio and of electrical equipment. That is factory inspection of such equipment.

Mr. CLARDY. Will you keep your voice up, please? It is rather difficult to hear you.

Mr. WEITZMAN. I have said that I was trained by the Signal Corps branch of the United States Government to be trained for the position of a Government inspector of electrical and radio equipment when it is manufactured, that is to help in the factory inspection of such radio and electrical equipment.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you engage in that type of work?

Mr. WEITZMAN. The learning of the work and the engaging in the inspection work was from March 1942 until the 1st of January 1944, when I was inducted in the service.

Mr. TAVENNER. May I ask at that point, what was the nature of your inspection work?

Mr. WEITZMAN. The nature of the inspection work was to examine the manufactured parts so that they may meet specifications laid down by my superiors.

Mr. TAVENNER. What type of electrical equipment was it?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Well, it was radio equipment such as condensers, resistors, receivers, and so forth, mechanical inspection.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did it have anything to do with electrical devices on weapons?

Mr. WEITZMAN. I don't know what you mean by "weapons." It was merely devices that would go into radio receivers and transmitters.

Mr. TAVENNER. Then you were inducted into the armed services in January 1944?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain in the armed services of the United States?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Well, I remained in the armed services of the United States from then until October 8, 1945, when I received an honorable discharge on the basis of dependency due to my child's condition, which justified my getting an honorable discharge on the basis of dependency.

Mr. TAVENNER. When you received your discharge, where did you then engage in work?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Well, after receiving the discharge, I went to Boston and my wife was in Boston then. She gave birth in Boston to my daughter and she remained there due to the difficulties, financial and

housing. It happens that we finally ended up in the city of Boston and I settled down and there is where I still remain resident.

Mr. TAVENNER. Where did you reside in Boston?

Mr. WEITZMAN. I resided in Roxbury. That is a part of the city of Boston.

Mr. TAVENNER. You remained as a resident of Boston from that time until the present time?

Mr. WEITZMAN. From that time until the present; yes.

Mr. TAVENNER. What other employment have you had?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Well, I became a substitute teacher in the Boston public schools, working on a day-to-day basis and getting paid as such until 1950, when I received a permanent appointment to teach in the elementary schools.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you begin your work as a teacher in the public schools in Boston?

Mr. WEITZMAN. My first day of teaching in the Boston public schools I remember clearly was October 18, 1945.

Mr. TAVENNER. When did you become a permanent teacher in the Boston public schools?

Mr. WEITZMAN. My permanent status began March 1, 1950.

Mr. TAVENNER. During that period of time did you engage in teaching of any other character besides that in the public schools of Boston?

Mr. WEITZMAN. To answer that question, being a question that pertains to matters of belief and association, I am constrained to invoke the first amendment, which I am entitled to maintain my freedom of speech as well as freedom of silence and, due to the present circumstances of public opinion, that is, the clime of public opinion in which we live today, I am constrained to invoke the fifth amendment and all its provisions, including that of self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Weitzman, I trust that you will reconsider your decision about that. I think it would be well at this time to review with you certain testimony that has been introduced before the Committee on Un-American Activities and to give you the benefit of certain other information that is in the possession of the committee which should set forth the background of your knowledge and things which this committee is interested in. After I have done so I hope you will reconsider the position which you are about to take.

A witness by the name of Herbert Philbrick testified before this committee as long ago as July 23, 1951, regarding an organized group of the Communist Party in Boston, composed principally of members of the teaching profession. Mr. Philbrick testified that in 1940 he became active in the Cambridge Youth Council; that as soon as he became convinced that he had run into Communist-front activities of the Communist Party, he informed the Federal Bureau of Investigation and then stayed on in the group for the purpose of reporting to the Government the activities of the Communists in their attempt to control the Cambridge Youth Council; that he subsequently joined other organizations for the purpose of obtaining information valuable to the United States Government, including the Young Communist League, and the Communist Party.

The date of his membership in the Communist Party began in March of 1944 and ended at the time of his expulsion from the Communist Party in April of 1949.

In the course of Mr. Philbrick's testimony, he stated that there were 14 cells that made up the professional group of the Communist Party in Boston and that each cell was assigned to various types of work based mostly upon the normal occupation of the members of the particular cell. For example, the doctors were assigned to a cell of the Communist Party composed exclusively of doctors. Upon being asked to name the other professional groups with which he was familiar, Mr. Philbrick testified that there was a teachers' group composed of a small number which he understood consisted of 5 or 6 persons at the time he was familiar with it. When asked if he knew the names of any of the teacher group, Mr. Philbrick replied, "No; I do not. Max Weitzman may have been one of them."

Although this language by Mr. Philbrick indicates some doubt in his mind as to your membership in that group, he describes in his testimony certain activities with which your name was connected, as shown from the following testimony, and this testimony by the way sets forth a background of a great deal of his knowledge of Communist Party activities and, of course, anyone associated with it would likewise have detailed knowledge.

I will now read to you from the testimony of Mr. Philbrick:

MR. TAVENNER. Mr. Philbrick, you described for us this morning the information of the Communist Political Association and also its dissolution. Did you take part in any of the convention activities which led up to the formation of the Communist Political Association?

MR. PHILBRICK. I attended the conventions of the CPA—that is, the formation of the CPA—but only as a visitor, not as a delegate. In fact, I had attended Communist Party conventions as far back as 1943, I believe, as a visitor, but it was not until 1945 that I attended as an actual delegate.

MR. TAVENNER. Did you at any time voice opposition to the formation of the Communist Political Association and the adoption of the less stringent views or activity by that organization?

MR. PHILBRICK. Yes; I did. It so happened that in 1944, just prior to the acceptance of Browderism, I had been attending some classes over at Dave Bennett's apartment which were very strictly Marxist classes, advocacy of violent revolution, and so forth.

So when the discussion came up at Alice Gordon's apartment regarding the dissolution of the Communist Party and the formation of the Communist Political Association, more to heckle the comrades than anything else, I voiced strenuous opposition to the change. I said I thought capitalism was still fighting for its own selfish ends, and we were making a great mistake in overthrowing the great revolutionary traditions of the party.

We had quite a time. The comrades were rather hard put for a while to explain all the changes. But of course in the end I did give in, as a good comrade, and admit that perhaps Comrade Browder was correct.

To advance the story now to 1945, when the Communist Party leaders again changed their minds and it was decided they had to get rid of this very vile creature, Mr. Browder, it was remembered on the State convention floor that Philbrick was the one who had held out the longest against this great evil; and for that reason I became somewhat of a great hero in 1945, and that was one of the reasons why I was assigned to educational work in the party, to teach Marxism to other comrades.

I might add I had no success at all in convincing my comrades in 1944 that they were wrong.

MR. TAVENNER. Then, as a result of that action, you finally became the head of the State Educational Commission of the Communist Party at the dissolution of the Communist Political Association; is that correct?

MR. PHILBRICK. No. I became a member of the education commission in charge of the propaganda work, in charge of the leaflet production. I was in charge of the printed material that the party produced from that time on. The first chairman was Justine O'Connor, then we had various chairman throughout the year.

Mr. TAVENNER. Can you recall now the names of the various chairmen of that commission?

Mr. PHILBRICK. The members of the commission at the time I became a member of it in 1945 were: Justine O'Connor, Otis Hood, Boone Schirmer, who later became a chairman—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. B-o-o-n-e S-c-h-i-r-m-e-r.

Mr. TAVENNER. Is that Daniel Boone Schirmer?

Mr. PHILBRICK. Daniel Boone Schirmer.

Max Weitzman.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will you spell the last name?

Mr. PHILBRICK. I can't recall the spelling. It was something like W-h-i-t-e-s-m-a-n or W-e-i-t-z-m-a-n; but Max was our chairman for quite a period of time. He was normally known only as Max.

And Manny Blum was a member of the commission and a leader of the group for a period of time.

Of course the group was headed up nationally by Jack Stachel of the national office.

Now Mr. Philbrick's knowledge of the Communist Party activities in Boston was such that resulted in his being called by another investigative committee of Congress within a comparatively recent time, but I understand the name of Max Weitzman was not referred to in the course of his testimony. However, Mr. Philbrick published a book which was copyrighted in 1952 entitled "I Led Three Lives: Citizen, Communist, Counter-Spy."

Beginning at page 172 of this book, Mr. Philbrick described a supersecret teacher-training course in the following language:

In the fall of 1945, the party carefully screened 1,500 Communists in the Boston area to attend a supersecret training school in Marxism. I was selected as 1 of the 16 candidates * * *. The supersecret teacher training course was scheduled for 8 sessions, 1 night a week, to be held in October and November 1945, at the West End Communist Club off Scollay Square in downtown Boston. * * *

Mr. Philbrick described the purposes of the school in the following language:

Fanny Hartman glanced about the room, and, assured that her full class was assembled, passed out the course outlines. Then, as the woman boss of the district party, she went to work.

"Comrades," her soft voice was like the stropping of a razor in the still room, "you all realize that this is not simply a routine course of Marxism-Leninism."

Mr. KANTROVITZ. It seems to me that is a very lengthy question.

Mr. CLARDY. Counsel, will you please subside? I told you at the beginning that you have no right to do what you are now doing.

Now, will you please proceed, Mr. Tavenner?

Mr. KANTROVITZ. I am sorry.

Mr. TAVENNER. I will repeat that:

"You all realize that this is not simply a routine course in Marxism-Leninism. You are all experienced enough, I hope, to know most of the facts of Marxist-Leninist teachings. If not, you wouldn't be here. This is a course to instruct you how to teach others, how to train your own comrades. You will have the responsibility of training our cadres so that they in turn can go out and win the workers to the Socialist struggle against the Fascist imperialists of the world, and in particular, the United States.

"This is a long-range program, part of an organized campaign throughout the party to rid every unit of the last vestiges of Browderism, to deepen the understanding of Marxist-Leninist theory." She leaned forward in her chair for emphasis. "In particular, you will study the application of Marx and Lenin to the conditions of the United States today. Your responsibilities will include organizing city and branch schools, and you will carry out a systematic checkup of Marxist study in every cell. You will lead some of the educational classes yourselves, and you will instruct others to lead similar classes."

The class members shuffled about in their chairs and settled down for a long session. I began making notes. Fanny delved into the importance of the tactics of proper teaching. A good instructor, she explained, can teach and influence any person along Communist lines no matter what his position in life.

The purposes of this supersecret training course were further emphasized in Mr. Philbrick's description of the occasion when a stranger, who was not introduced to the class, occupied the place at the instructor's table.

His appearance—
stated Mr. Philbrick—

was very brief, and he had only a few words to say to the class. But it soon became evident that his soft voice carried the weight of the national Politburo. He spoke of the reconstitution of the party, the reestablishment of rigid Marxism in every segment of party organization, the renewal of the struggle against bourgeois influences.

"Comrades," he added, "as a result of the war we have seen a great intensification of the contradictions between the two world systems—socialism and capitalism. In this country we shall see a sharper growth of fascism and the building of the class struggle which will eventually bring the establishment of socialism. The party does not consider the raising of the question of revolution as an immediate slogan for action. We must first reorganize the party in its vanguard role and function as the leader of the American proletariat.

"Under Browder's revisionism we have become soft. This calls for a special evaluation, and for an increase of our internal as well as our external vigilance. Externally, we must defeat Red baiting. Internally we must take special measures to protect our party organization and membership. We must deal ruthlessly with agents of the enemy. You," he said his eyes passing around the room and missing none of us, "will have special responsibilities in this task."

My "special responsibilities" soon became plain. After one of the class sessions toward the end of the course, Fanny Hartman stopped me at the door and drew me aside.

"There will be a special meeting of a new group at the office Saturday afternoon," she told me, out of earshot of the others. "Two o'clock. Be sure to be there."

On the following Saturday I passed the morning at the M. & P. Theaters office cleaning up some back work. Then, after lunch, I proceeded to district headquarters, rode the elevator to the sixth floor, walked down a flight on the fire stairs, and entered the Communist Party headquarters.

The meeting was held in Fanny Hartman's inner sanctum. But I was surprised to discover that Fanny was not there.

Then he proceeded to describe a meeting of six individuals, including himself. The man who ran the group, as he stated, was Emmanuel or "Manny" Blum, a New York-trained Communist sent by national headquarters to New England to replace Fanny Hartman as district organizer.

Mr. Philbrick identified you at this point on page 182 along with his statement at page 186 of his book, as a member of that group.

He says on page 182 of his book:

The group of six Communists came to be known among us privately as the Jack Stachel group for New England. More formally, it was the district educational commission of the Communist Party, operating directly under Jack Stachel as the national educational director.

Mr. Philbrick also had occasion to refer to you in connection with his description of the method used by the Communist Party to exploit disunity and create confusion in election campaigns. He stated at page 191 of his book:

Every election campaign from the local school board to the Presidency became fair game for Communist intrusion and infiltration—with or without the knowledge or assent of the candidates.

Anthony M. Roche was a Democratic candidate for Congress from the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts in the 1946 off-year election. The Roche campaign was an example of what can happen on the local level to an anti-Communist candidate, in an anti-Communist community, when a handful of ardent Communists seek to use him as a propaganda outlet. He had no opportunity to give his assent when the Communist Party branch of Malden, Mass., moved in on his campaign. He did not even know it. He had no idea that he had been carefully handpicked ahead of time to serve as a grindstone for the "sharpening of contradictions." Roche had no Communist sympathies—far from it. He was a liberal spokesman of organized labor and a determined anti-Communist, too astute and independent to be made into a party dupe. Yet despite his astuteness and his hostility to Communists, he was tricked into their employment by the same methods that can be and are brought to bear on candidates for office in any political subdivision of the United States. Roche happened to be a Democrat. But in view of the objectives of the Communist Party in the political area before and after the Browder era, a Republican candidate would be equally vulnerable to Communist chicanery. Political principles don't matter. The Communist Party can make use of them all.

I was one of the five Malden Communists who worked from the beginning on the Anthony Roche campaign in 1946. With other comrades in the district, I plotted behind doors, which carefully barred Roche and his advisers, to take over his campaign in spite of his own anti-Communist position. Beyond certain fundamentals, we were not concerned with what Roche stood for. He was picked not only in spite of but even because of his anticommunism. We didn't care whether he won, and in fact we never expected him to win. All we wanted was one foot on his campaign platform.

And then he continued at page 202 as follows:

In the midst of the Roche campaign, a branch executive meeting was called in Malden. Max Weitzman was the "expert" assigned from State headquarters as the educational speaker of the evening.

"Let us not forget," said Max in his discussion, "that it doesn't make much difference whether price controls as they are now proposed are on or off. Capitalism is caught in a trap of contradictions which the economy cannot shake loose."

Out of his explanation I understood that the party could count the issue of price controls a victory one way or the other. If a strong program of controls went through, the Government bureaucracy necessary to enforce them would be accordingly reinforced. And Communists are probureaucratic, in that they recognize bureaucracy as one of the "creeping diseases of capitalism." The party teaches that, as capitalism grows, bureau is piled on bureau in an effort to control the growth. Eventually, Stalin and Lenin believe, the government becomes topheavy, and the whole thing crashes.

Now, Mr. Weitzman, I have gone into much detail in connection with testimony and information relating to you for the purpose of showing you the background of matters that I want to discuss with you.

Mr. Philbrick, as many other witnesses, performed a service of great value to the Congress, the Government, and the people of this country in giving this committee facts within his knowledge relating to the Communist conspiracy in our midst. I want to give you every opportunity to make an equal contribution to the sum total of knowledge of the committee on these important matters. The committee is particularly interested at this time in obtaining all possible information regarding the plan of the Communist Party to organize teachers, and to extend its discipline to members of the teaching profession, the exact purposes of the Communist Party in this specialized field, the extent to which it has succeeded or failed in its activities, and the methods by which it seeks to accomplish its purposes.

This is a very important matter, and I ask you to tell the committee whether or not you are willing to cooperate with it in giving the facts

as may be within your personal knowledge regarding these matters. If you have not already done so, take time to confer with your counsel. I am sure the chairman of this subcommittee will adjourn for a while to give you an opportunity to discuss it if you desire.

Mr. WEITZMAN. Excuse me.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

(At this point Mr. Weitzman conferred with Mr. Kantrovitz.)

Mr. TAVENNER. May I interrupt your conference with your counsel to add one thing more. If you need more time to consider what action you will take, we could very easily put this hearing off until tomorrow or until some further time to give you the opportunity to consider this matter fully in light of all the circumstances that you know of.

Mr. WEITZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the record straight and the inferences impugning my loyalty and allegiance to the United States Constitution and my allegiance to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a teacher. The inference also impugning or poisoning or attempting to poison my relation with my community and my school. I have demonstrated in the armed forces an honorable devotion to my country and I have always been proud of the uniform which I wore and I still reaffirm that allegiance and that devotion. My family has already made the supreme sacrifice and, considering the unpredictable fortunes of war, it could very well have been me instead of my brother.

I have as a teacher never violated the oath which is incumbent upon me as a teacher—that is, allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. To expect a public school teacher to possess only beliefs which are of a conformity nature and not to allow the teacher to become a citizen as well and if possible nonconformity beliefs is to relegate the teaching profession to an inferior status.

I am not going to betray my privacy to this committee. I am going to maintain my constitutional privileges and rights to my freedom of opinions and speech and likewise my freedom of silence of those opinions, whether they are conformist or nonconformist.

My right to associate is also given me by the first amendment. I do not remember if the inferences or the references you have made were to questions of belief that reflect on violence, but as a public school teacher and as a member of the Jewish community I am more upset than anything else concerning the recent pattern.

Mr. CLARDY. That will be enough. We will desist from that answer and either give an answer saying that you refuse to answer or you will answer "yes" or "no," and you will desist from the speechmaking and the haranguing that you are imposing upon the committee. Now, proceed in that fashion, sir, or I shall silence you.

Mr. WEITZMAN. But as a sensitive teacher—

Mr. CLARDY. Did you understand what I said?

Now, answer the question as I indicated, or we will tolerate no more of this. If you wish to avail yourself of the fifth amendment, you may do so. But you will not be permitted to harangue the committee as you have been doing. My patience is exhausted. Now, you will proceed as I indicated.

Mr. WEITZMAN. Then may I continue?

Mr. CLARDY. You may not continue as you have, but as I have indicated.

Mr. WEITZMAN. Yes, I am going to continue.

Mr. CLARDY. Now, answer as I have told you.

Mr. WEITZMAN. With regard to the matter you have mentioned, in the light of the present circumstances, in the light of public opinion, I am constrained to assert my privileges under the fifth amendment, all aspects of the fifth amendment, including that which pertains to self-incrimination.

Mr. CLARDY. Very well. You are refusing to answer.

Do you have any further questions, Counsel?

Mr. TAVENNER. Of course my question, Mr. Chairman, was whether he would be willing to cooperate. He has indicated that he would not.

Mr. CLARDY. I understand he has refused to answer your question on the constitutional ground which he has advanced. If you have any further questions, I suggest you proceed.

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. CLARDY. I shall not tolerate any more harangues of that kind.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Weitzman, are you aware of any effort having been made by the Communist Party to organize a cell or group of the Communist Party in Boston composed of members of the teaching profession?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Mr. Chairman, that question comes under the category of association as well as belief, and in the circumstances of public opinion I am again constrained to assert my privilege under the fifth amendment and I decline to answer, also, under the grounds of the first amendment.

Mr. CLARDY. Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have any personal knowledge of the activities of a group known as the Jack Stachel group for New England which was more formally referred to as the District Educational Commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEITZMAN. All knowledge pertaining to association and to belief I do not concede this committee's right to inquire into.

Mr. CLARDY. That is the prerogative of the committee to decide. When a question is propounded to you you may either answer or stand upon your constitutional ground as the reason for refusing to answer. We will not tolerate, and I repeat it, we will not tolerate any more lectures to this committee.

Now, will you ask the question again, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Do you have personal knowledge of the activities of a group known as the Jack Stachel group for New England, or more formally known as the District Educational Commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEITZMAN. As I have already indicated in my previous remarks, and in the light of present hysterical circumstances of public opinion I am constrained to assert my privileges under the fifth amendment, all those privileges including the right against self-incrimination; also on the ground of the first amendment as it reflects the right of opinion, association, and so forth.

Mr. CLARDY. You will strike from the record all that part of the answer except the fact that he is standing upon his constitutional grounds as stated, Mr. Reporter.

Mr. KANTROVITZ. Congressman Clardy—

Mr. CLARDY. I will not listen to counsel. I have told you before that counsel has no privilege of addressing the Chair.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you personally acquainted with Herbert Philbrick?

Mr. WEITZMAN. Questions pertaining to individuals, questions pertaining to association are the same and I have the right to associate or refuse to associate with whomever I choose. That is my right. Hence I feel that I would be impugning the first amendment and therefore I decline to answer on the grounds of the first amendment and in the light of the present circumstances I assert the privileges under the fifth amendment and all its provisions.

Mr. CLARDY. It will be sufficient in the future for you to say that you refuse to answer upon the grounds previously stated, if that is your desire, and we will follow that and avoid long, drawn-out answers.

Now, will you proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Mr. Philbrick's identification of you as a member of the supersecret teacher-training group of the Communist Party true or was it false?

Mr. WEITZMAN. I decline to answer on the grounds of privilege as previously stated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Was Mr. Philbrick's identification of you as chairman of the district educational commission of the Communist Party true or false?

Mr. WEITZMAN. I decline to answer on constitutional grounds as previously indicated.

Mr. TAVENNER. Did you address a branch of the Communist Party at Malden, Mass., during the election campaign of Mr. Roche?

Mr. WEITZMAN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds as I have already given this committee.

Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEITZMAN. That question also pertains to the right of association or lack of association, and it is therefore my right under the Constitution to refuse to answer under the first as well as the fifth amendment, particularly the provision against self-incrimination.

Mr. TAVENNER. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. WEITZMAN. I wish to give the same answer to this question as I have to the previous question.

Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLARDY. I have no questions whatever. Is there any reason this witness should be continued under the subpoena?

Mr. TAVENNER. No.

Mr. CLARDY. The witness is excused, and this hearing is adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 5:10 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 10 a. m., Thursday, April 23, 1953.)

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

	Page
Amdur, Isadore-----	1016, 1017, 1018, 1029, 1046-1060 (testimony)
Arguimbau, Lawrence-----	1018, 1029, 1048
Arnold, Kenneth-----	1052
Blaisdell, B. E.-----	1018, 1021, 1029, 1048
Blum, Manny-----	1065, 1066
Bridgeman, Howard Allen-----	1049
Browder, Earl-----	1027, 1031, 1064, 1066, 1067
Browder, Felix-----	1027
Brown, Gerald (Jerry)-----	1038, 1039
Cobb, David-----	1035, 1036-1045
Cort, Joseph Henry-----	999, 1038
Darling, Byron-----	1037
Davis, Robert Gorham-----	981, 982
Dontzin, Ben-----	1000, 1038
Dowker, Hugh-----	1022
Duclos, Jacques-----	1033
Edsall, Richard-----	1049
Fine, Daniel-----	1000, 1038
Forer, Joseph-----	977-987
Furry, Wendell H.-----	982, 1017, 1048, 1058
Gordon, Alice-----	1064
Gelbart, A. M.-----	1018, 1026, 1029, 1048
Grossenbacher, Carl-----	1022, 1048, 1049
Halperin, Israel-----	983, 984, 985, 1018, 1025, 1026, 1029
Hartman, Fanny-----	1065, 1066
Hicks, Granville-----	981
Hiss, Alger-----	1056
Hood, Otis-----	1065
Hurvich, Leo M.-----	977-978 (testimony), 1017, 1018
Kantrovitz, Gabriel-----	1061-1070
Kerner, William-----	1000, 1038
Levinson, Norman-----	1016, 1018, 1029, 1048
Levy, Arthur-----	1000, 1038
Lewis, Sinclair-----	1044
Markham, Helen Deane-----	1025
Martin, William Ted-----	1013, 1014-1035 (testimony), 1052
O'Connor, Justine-----	1064, 1065
Philbrick, Herbert-----	1022, 1049, 1063-1066, 1070
Polumbaum, Theodore S.-----	987, 988-1012 (testimony), 1038
Putter, Norman-----	1026
Rand, Stuart C.-----	1013, 1014-1035, 1046-1060
Reynolds, John H.-----	1022
Roche, Anthony N.-----	1067, 1070
Rosen, Nathan-----	1048
Rubinstein, Bernard W.-----	1038
Rubinstein, William-----	1001
Schirmer, Daniel Boone-----	1065
Shubow, Lawrence D.-----	987, 988-1012
Singer, Marcus-----	1049
Stachel, Jack-----	1065, 1066, 1069
Struik, Dirk J.-----	1016-1018, 1022, 1023, 1048
Veall, Norman-----	1025
Wahl, Albert E.-----	1041, 1042

	Page
Wallman, Henry	1022
Weissbrodt	1035
Weitzman, Max	1061
Woerner, Harold T.	1001, 1039
Ziesel, Paul Rudolph	1002, 1035, 1036-1045 (testimony)

ORGANIZATIONS

American Academy of Arts and Sciences	1052
American Association of Scientific Workers	982, 983, 984, 1025, 1029, 1030, 1051
American Federation of Teachers	981
American Newspaper Guild	1003
American Youth for Democracy	1041, 1045
B'nai B'rith	1003
Boston University	1062
Cambridge Youth Council	1063
College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.	1036
College of the City of New York	1061
Colorado A. and M. College	1036
Federal Bureau of Investigation	1063
Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians	1034
German-American Bund	1003
Harvard College	978, 1017, 1022
Harvard University	980, 981, 1048, 1049
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton	1014
John Reed Club	1009, 1010, 1011
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1014-1018, 1022, 1023, 1025, 1027-1029, 1031, 1032, 1034, 1046-1050
Princeton University	1018
Progressive Citizens of America	1002
Subversive Activities Control Board	993, 994
Syracuse University	1014, 1021, 1025, 1034
United Press	988, 995, 1002-1005
United Press Association	995, 1012
University of Arkansas	1014
University of Connecticut	1036
University of Illinois	1014
University of Pittsburgh	1046
University of Wisconsin	1036, 1037, 1039, 1041
Wisconsin Liberals Association	1011
World Federation of Scientific Workers	1051
Yale University	988, 989, 1012, 1036-1039
Young Communist League	1041, 1045, 1063
Young Progressives	1002

PUBLICATIONS

Acme News Pictures	995, 1003
Daily Worker	1001
Das Kapital	1059
Gazette and Daily, York, Pa.	988, 995
Hartford Courant	1041
I Led Three Lives: Citizen, Communist, Counterspy	1065
Worker	1001



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 3038

